

S P E E C H

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE

SYLVESTER DOUGLAS,

IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

TUESDAY, APRIL THE 23D, 1799,

ON SECONDING THE MOTION OF THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, FOR THE HOUSE
TO AGREE WITH THE LORDS IN AN ADDRESS TO HIS
MAJESTY,

RELATIVE TO

A UNION WITH IRELAND.

‘ There hath been put in practice in governments, these two several
‘ kinds of policy in uniting and conjoining of states and kingdoms; the
‘ one, to retain the ancient form still severed, and only conjoined in
‘ sovereignty; the other, to superinduce a new form, agreeable and
‘ convenient to the entire estate. The former of these hath been
‘ more usual, but the latter is more happy.’

LORD BACON.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED FOR JOHN MILLIKEN, 32, GRAFTON-STREET.

1799.

IRISH 1798 COLLECTION

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

S P E E C H,

&c. &c.

MR. SPEAKER,

I TOOK occasion, on a former day^a, to express my humble hope, that if a regular opportunity should again occur, the House would permit me to lay before them some thoughts on this great subject, which have appeared to me worthy of their attention; and to explain some of the grounds on which my opinion has been formed in favour of a Union with Ireland.

Nobody to whom I am known, will, I am persuaded, impute to me the presumptuous folly of imagining that I have it in my power to improve on what those men of transcendent talents and eminent political wisdom and experience, who have taken the principal share in the former debates, have advanced on the leading points of this question. But it is a question of such extent, that it may fairly be thought that even yet several important topics remain for consideration, and some new views of those which have been already discussed. It has been for a considerable length of time before the public in both

^a On Thursday, February 14, after reporting the resolutions.

kingdoms : it has given rise to various arguments in both Houses of this and the other Parliament : and, upon every fresh occasion, additional lights have been thrown upon it, and new difficulties and objections have been raised, by the fertility and eagerness of contest and opposition.

Some of those objections may have seemed plausible or ingenious ; scarcely any, I think, have been weighty or substantial ; none, I am sure, of sufficient weight to counterbalance the numerous benefits which there is such reason to expect from the adoption of the measure. But they have been frequently suited to meet those passions and prejudices, which naturally exist, or have been artfully excited, in our sister kingdom ; and, if we feel it our duty to recommend the proposed incorporation to our fellow-subjects there, we owe it to them and to ourselves to spare no pains in the endeavour to remove, by dispassionate reasoning and cool deliberation, such obstacles as may have appeared to them, or any number of them, to stand in the way of what most of us here, I believe, consider as *material* for our interests and *essential* to theirs.

To those who have attended to the various modes of resistance to the proposal of an Union, which have been resorted to by different persons, *two* circumstances must have occurred as very remarkable.

One has been so well expressed in the resolutions of the Grand Jury of the county of the city of Cork, that I should do it injustice not to introduce the mention of it in the very language they have used : ‘ Whilst we lament,’ say they, ‘ that any difference of opinion should exist in this kingdom upon so important a question, we cannot but remember how unanimous the rebellious and
‘ traitorous

‘ traitorous enemies of the country are in their reprobation of the measure^a.’

The plan of the United Irishmen, with the assistance of the inveterate foe of the British empire and constitution, is to effect a separation between Great Britain and Ireland. It is natural therefore that they should dread nothing so much as any measure which *they* must look upon as fatal to that favourite object. That separation is their favourite object we have many incontestable proofs; but it is sufficient for me now to refer to the declaration of their founder, Tone, subjoined to the Report of the Secret Committee of the Irish House of Lords in 1797^b; and the detestation of a Union, which on that account the same class of men have always expressed, is equally notorious. The furious declamations of *M^cNevin*, *Lewins*, and others^c, have been more than once referred to in this place^d; and within not many weeks from the present moment, some of those self-convicted traitors have contrived to publish to the world new libels on the government and constitution of their country^e, their main view in which has manifestly been to co-operate, to this particular end, with those who, though of a very different description, and acting undoubtedly from motives of mistaken patriotism, have exerted their talents and influence to counteract and retard what I am well persuaded the good sense of

^a Vide the resolutions of the Grand Jury of the county of the city of Cork, 26th March 1799.

^b No. 11.

^c Proceedings of the meeting at Francis Street Chapel, 1795.

^d Vide Speech of the Right Hon. *Henry Addington*, p. 21, &c. &c.

^e *Arthur O'Connor's Letter to Lord Castlereagh*,—Demonstration, &c. Ascribed to *Dr. M^cNevin*.

that nation will not suffer them ultimately to defeat, that happy consolidation of the empire which his Majesty's paternal goodness has recommended to the consideration of both his Parliaments.

The *other* circumstance to which I have referred appears to me not less striking. It is, that the opposers of Union have almost all endeavoured to convince us that the case of the incorporation of Scotland and England in 1707, is not in any degree applicable on the present occasion.

I think there is considerable dexterity, though perhaps not a great deal of candour, in this attempt. In all great political operations, experience and historical precedent are the best and safest guides. Those gentlemen have, therefore, justly thought they should have a better chance of gaining their end, if they could induce us to shut our eyes against history, and wander with them in the obscure mazes of theory and speculation. Their ingenuity might then perhaps bewilder and perplex us; whereas, if we recur to that memorable event, its similarity to what is now proposed, both in principle and in all its most characteristic features, is so great, that they naturally feel it furnishes, by its complete success, after the trial of a century, the strongest and most irresistible refutation of their arguments.

In the first and preliminary point, for instance, of the question of Union, that transaction is most especially applicable, being the direct case of a national decision on the
right

right and competency of Parliament. I will not enter at large into the general argument concerning the extraordinary powers of the supreme legislature of a country. It has been amply and ably treated in several of the prior stages of the present business, in this House. If the Parliament, in our representative government, is not competent to treat of, and conclude an incorporated Union, there is no authority which is; and, consequently, a legitimate Union, in such governments, never could take place.

The constituent body, or the electors, have no such authority; they have not, by the practice or true theory of our constitution, any power of deliberation on any question whatever; their only business as electors being that of selecting and nominating those whom they think the fittest persons to exercise that share of legislation which is vested in the third estate of Parliament: the act of the election is the beginning and end of their functions; the latent political rights of the people at large, whatever they may be, have not been delegated to *them*; and those gentlemen, on the other side, who are the most strenuous advocates against a Union, would, I should think, be very unwilling to devolve that authority which is denied to the elected, on the elective body, as now constituted; since, in their opinion, they ought to be deprived of the very elective franchise itself, by what they call a *reform of Parliament*; the scheme of such reform being, in many instances literally, and virtually in all, to deprive the present electors of that franchise.

But if the electors cannot deliberate and decide on such a measure, much less can the people at large; who never, I believe, in the smallest state, or most complete democracy, have

have exercised, in fact, by universal individual suffrage, deliberate, judicial, or legislative authority. Yet to maintain that the constitutional legislature of a country has not the right of doing certain acts, however clearly beneficial to that country, without a previous special commission from the mass of the nation, leads immediately to the false and mischievous principle of the *direct sovereignty of the people*, and to that equally mischievous fiction to which it has given rise, *viz.* That an *original compact* between the governors and governed is the only lawful foundation of government. Indeed, to resort to the elementary parts of a nation, the numerical aggregate of individuals composing it, for authority to form a union, would be a complete admission of such sovereignty; as the terms and conditions with which this numerical mass might choose to accompany that delegation of power, would be an exemplification of such original compact. But what sort of philosophy is that which traces the foundation of all political phenomena to a fact which no history shews ever to have existed, which the consideration of the human character and the daily transactions, and past and present situations of life, demonstrate to be, and always to have been impossible, and every attempt to realize which either by the *Jacquerie* in ancient France, the *Wat Tylers* and *Jack Straws* in England, or the modern *Jacobines*, has proved as pernicious and destructive^a, as
to

^a It has been unfortunate for the world, that so great and upright a man as Mr. *Locke* (led astray by the circumstances of the times in which he lived, and the zeal of controversy) should have been the patron and advocate of this baneful, but, in his hands, too plausible and specious doctrine. *Locke's* fate has indeed been singular. He was a good subject and
a pious

to suppose the possibility of its actual existence, is foolish and absurd. The fatal consequences of such attempts to *res-tore*, as it is called, to the people the sovereignty they are imagined to have farmed out, as it were, to their rulers, subject to divers claims of forfeiture and re-entry, has indeed been too well illustrated by the late eventful history of a neighbouring kingdom, for us here, or our fellow-subjects in Ireland, to require much argument to convince us

a pious Christian. Yet, as his theory of government has served for a basis to the destructive systems of the *Condorcets*, *Priestleys*, and *Paynes*, so his metaphysical principles have become the groundwork of the vain wisdom and false philosophy which began by denying the existence of the material world, and proceeded, in the writings of the late Mr. *Hume* and others, to extend that wild scepticism of an ingenious and well-intentioned Prelate* to the disbelief of spirit also, of the immortal nature of man, and the being of God himself. This remark has been, in a great measure, occasioned by my recollection of a truly great philosopher, to whose early lessons and kindness I look back with tenderness and pride, who was among the first to prove that system adopted by *Locke* concerning ideas, tended, by its natural consequence, to those of *Berkeley* and *Hume*; but who, in announcing that opinion to the world, anxiously disclaimed every wish or intention to disparage the talents of those, the fallacy and danger of whose doctrines he thought he could demonstrate, and every view of arrogating to himself any peculiar sagacity and discernment on that account. Indeed those who remember him, know that there never was learning and wisdom more free from arrogance and presumption than his. ‘A traveller,’ says he, ‘of good judgment may mistake his way, and be led unawares into a wrong track; and while the road is fair before him, may go on without suspicion, and be followed by others; but when it ends in a precipice, it requires no peculiar degree of wisdom and penetration to know he has gone wrong, nor perhaps to find out what misled him†.’

* Bishop *Berkeley*.

† Dr. *Reid*’s *Enquiry into the Human Mind*, p. 23.

of its folly and wickedness. It has in that country overturned the throne of the Monarch and the altars of God: it has sanctioned murder, parricide, and regicide; and has taught every illiterate peasant to consider himself as a fit candidate for supreme power, the sovereign of his sovereign, and the lawgiver of mankind—

*Ergo, regibus occisis, subversa jacebat
Pristina majestas soliorum et sceptrum superba,
Res itaque ad summam faciem turbasque redibat^a.*

I agree with a person justly eminent, and for whom I entertain a very sincere respect, when he says, ‘that it is dangerous in a popular assembly to state that there are points where the powers of the legislature end, and those of the people at large begin^b.’ Indeed I know of no point where a legitimate constitutional power in the people at large begins; there may be some very special cases to which that of the legislature cannot reach; and in which, according to my conception, when any measure becomes necessary and unavoidable, not the power, i. e. any *rightful* power of the people, but the dissolution of the constitution and government, will begin; from which anarchy it must be left, in such cases, to chance, to the circumstances of the times, the force of habit, the intrinsic merit of ancient institutions, and the prudence and virtue of individuals possessing influence, either personal or from situation, to extricate the na-

^a Lucret. lib. v. ver. 1135.

^b Vide the Speech of the Right Hon. *John Foster*, p. 108. I had not then received the correct edition, but I had seen several accounts of it in different newspapers. I shall take the liberty now to refer to it according to that correct edition in some of the following pages.

tion. It is indeed delicate and dangerous wantonly to moot such sort of cases: no judge of human nature who is a friend to his country, ever will; whatever may be his particular creed and party on matters fairly debateable, and open to a safe difference in opinion.

There are however cases of another description, which may be more freely discussed, to which also the supreme power of the Legislature (in our constitution, of the Parliament) cannot extend; but which, being of a negative kind, and not requiring any measure to be taken or act done, do not connect themselves with the notion of any necessary dissolution of the frame of the government. They are, in truth, of such a sort, that, on their correct analysis, it will be found, that the idea of the application of that power involves either physical or moral impossibility, or a natural contradiction in the terms of the proposition.

Two examples, material for the present purpose, especially the last of them, will illustrate the distinction to which I have wished to draw the attention of the House.

1st. Parliament cannot pass a law which a subsequent Parliament shall not be able to repeal. The plain reason of this is, that the supposition of such a power is contradictory to itself. It is to suppose the Parliament of next year less absolute and supreme than the Parliament of this^b.

2d. I have heard it contended, not without plausibility, that the Parliament cannot dismember the kingdom or

^b *Coke's Inst.* part iv. p. 42, 43.

circumscribe the sphere of its own authority, and consequently that on that account it cannot, dissolve any union which by treaty or otherwise hath blended into one state, subject to its authority, parts which existed, previous to such treaty, in a separate and distinct condition, with separate legislatures; that to suppose it capable of doing this is also a contradiction in terms; that the nation and its Parliament are such indivisible integral parts, the one governed, the other governing, and forming together one indivisible aggregate or body politic; that if you detach any part of this body, what remains is no longer the same state, the same nation, the same legislature or parliament; that the two parts may form themselves again each or either into a similar constitution to what before existed, or into other constitutions; but that the dismemberment will have effected that sort of resolution of the aggregate into its elements, which is known to happen in our municipal law, when, by the loss of an integral part, an ordinary corporation is dissolved, and loses its corporate existence; that it is universally true, that the dismemberment of any legitimate state cannot be a legitimate act of that state; but necessarily supposes, even on cessions in virtue of conquest, exchange, &c. a disruption of the integrity of the state; that it might be difficult to argue this position on the history of those ill-constructed constitutions, where dismemberment has in fact often taken place, or with regard to extreme cases, of the cession of small insignificant portions of a large dominion; but that nobody will say that the actual state and constitution of Great Britain would remain if the county of Northumberland or Cornwall, the ancient kingdom of Scotland, or the principality of Wales, were detached from it.

But,

But, in the case of a union and incorporation of new parts, the incompetency of parliament to decompose them is, I think, abundantly obvious; without adopting the foregoing opinion to its full extent, which I by no means do, with regard to the dismemberment of some original fraction, or district, of what had always constituted one and the same state. The essential condition of such a union is the combination of each of the constituent parts into a new whole, in which the identical characters and qualities of those parts are so lost that they can no where afterwards be found or restored. The contracting parties cease to exist, and become incapable of being revived. It is as impossible to replace them *in statu quo*, as it would be to recover the identical parts of two images of the same metal, which may have been melted together, and cast into one new figure made up of both. Physically, or even morally and politically speaking, Scotland, as a country, might be again disjoined from England: it might again have Parliaments, as England might have; but this must be by a process exactly the same with that which should separate Cornwall, Norfolk, Caithness, or Sutherland, from Great Britain. It would not be a reintegration or restoration of Scotland to her former state, as she existed before 1707: that state has been melted down and indissolubly mingled with that of England, which, in like manner, can never become a separate kingdom, as of its ancient right.

If this reasoning is as just and correct as it appears to me, all apprehensions and alarms must necessarily vanish (alarms sometimes attempted to be raised when it has been thought they might assist a little dearth of argument), of Great Britain assuming a right to break through, and set

aside, at her pleasure, any incorporation of this kingdom and that of Ireland, which the wisdom and patriotism of the two Parliaments may adopt. After a Union, Ireland may again be separated from Great Britain, as England may be torn asunder from Scotland, by domestic faction and civil war, or by foreign hostility; but they never can be disjoined by any regular act of the united Government and Legislature.

In short, it appears to me that a common Parliament, such as was formed on the Scotch Union, and must be in contemplation now, must have the power of altering or repealing any of the former acts of either of the local Legislatures, i. e. either English or Scotch, British or Irish, a power daily exercised in regard to English and Scotch acts made previous to 1707; but that such common Parliament cannot legitimately repeal or alter any of the fundamental and essential clauses, articles, or conditions of that treaty, by which the Union shall be constituted; since the treaty authorized by each Legislature, concluded by commissioners, and then again ratified by each Legislature, when carried into effect, will render it impossible, upon any breach, for either party to resume its former situation, and avail itself of the nullity thereby occasioned, and of course impossible, consistently with moral right and duty, for the united Parliament, i. e. beyond its legitimate powers, to commit such a breach.

Before I proceed, the House will permit me to explain what may otherwise be liable to misrepresentation or misconstruction. Though I have denied the strict right of the constituent body to deliberate and decide on political questions,

tions, and either to limit or extend, by special commission and instructions, the powers vested by law in their representatives, yet I am very clearly of opinion, that the representatives does not perform his duty, or consult the true interest of his country, who does not pay a due and respectful attention to the sentiments, and even, in many cases, to the inclinations and wishes of his particular constituents and of the proprietors and inhabitants of the place he represents (with whom he commonly has the easiest means of communication), as well as to the opinions which prevail in general among the different classes of his fellow-subjects. It is very true that there neither exists, nor can exist, any legal or formal method of collecting the individual opinions and suffrages of a whole nation; still, however, the predominant sentiment will force its way to the observation and understanding of the legislators, and will be in many, perhaps in most cases, the best and most prudent guide for them to follow. If they neglect it, the period of re-election enables the voters (the majority of whom, even as now constituted in this kingdom, taking the whole country over, will, I believe, always be found to accord with the majority of the nation itself) to select others who think more as they do on those subjects of public concern which they have nearest their hearts.

After all, some may think I might have spared the House and myself the trouble of the foregoing discussion, as few, very few, within these walls have gone so far as directly to maintain the general incompetence of Parliament to such a measure as a Union. But several, by expressions of doubt and surmise, by ambiguous words, scattered abroad at the risk of misleading the vulgar, the ill-informed, or ill-disposed, among his Majesty's subjects in Ireland, have set
out

out with involving their opinion on this material point in oracular obscurity, and have then gone on to assert, that whatever may have been the right of the English or of the Scotch Parliament in 1707, a Union between Great Britain and Ireland, or, at least, such a Union as is supposed to be intended, cannot be lawfully agreed to or carried into effect by either of the Parliaments of those respective kingdoms. They assume, as the case I think must be, that in the midst of those who have proposed, or are friends to the measure, the proportion of members to be sent by Ireland to the united Parliament is meant to be considerably less than the number of British members; which, if the example of the Scotch Union shall be followed in this particular, will remain as at present. ‘ This,’ it is said, ‘ would, in effect, amount to a total *surrender* of the legislative authority of Ireland to Great Britain. But the constituents of the Irish Parliament delegated to their representatives the power with which they invested them, for the purpose of exercising, not of surrendering, those powers, for the purpose of maintaining a supreme, independent, and exclusive Legislature for Ireland, not to enable them to betray and destroy the independency, or rather the existence, of the Irish Legislature.’ This,’ it is alleged, ‘ must be the case, if the members for Ireland are in a great disproportion to those for Great Britain. Though the British Parliament, therefore, should be supposed competent to *receive*, in accession to its legislative authority over Great Britain, the like power over Ireland, the Irish Parliament can have no right to *bestow* that power, and subject their country, in that manner, to the government of a foreign Legislature. The addition of one-sixth, one-fifth, or one-fourth, to the present aggregate number of British members will leave the British Parlia-

‘ ment

‘ ment as exclusively supreme over Great Britain as before,
 ‘ and will, at the same time, communicate to Great Britain
 ‘ as entire a supremacy over Ireland as she formerly claim-
 ‘ ed (before the epoch of 1782) when that country was
 ‘ totally unrepresented in Great Britain.’

In stating this sort of argument, which I have endeavoured not to weaken or misrepresent, the case of Scotland seemed to militate so strongly both against the *conclusion* of incompetency, and the assumed *fact* from which that conclusion is drawn, namely, the exercise of exclusive power by the greater over the lesser country, that every effort of ingenuity has been used, though unsuccessfully, to find out some intelligible ground of distinction between that transaction and the measure now in agitation.

1st. With regard to *the fact*. It is a matter of such acknowledged notoriety, that in questions of a local nature, or which nearly concern the northern division of this united kingdom, the members returned by Scotland have generally influenced the opinion and vote of the whole House of Commons, that the Gentlemen on the other side have not been able to deny it. They have, therefore, been obliged to content themselves with the hope that this, like other circumstances relative to the Scotch Union, may be ascribed to something of a mysterious and undefinable nature, peculiar to the character and situation of that people; and they insist, that whatever may have in practice counteracted the natural consequence of the superiority of numbers in that case, it is not less certain that the whole legislative authority over Scotland is vested in the English members, than that 513 is a larger number than 45.

2d. As

2d. As to *the conclusion*, they argue, that if the surrender (as they insist on terming it) which was made by the Scotch Parliament have not vitiated the whole transaction, it is either because the lapse of time and long acquiescence on the part of that country have, by a sort of prescription, confirmed the authority of the Parliament now denominated British, but still, in effect, only English, over Scotland; or because the Scotch Parliament was expressly empowered and commissioned by the constituents in that kingdom to agree to a Union.

In answer to these refinements it may be observed,

1st. That it is a new sort of prescription which can confirm or render valid, what, in its commencement, was a mere nullity; especially where the acts by which this nullity has been turned into a right, must, if the argument is well founded, have been throughout equally null and void. If the Scotch Parliament could not, in 1707, legally ratify the Treaty of Union, the act by which they purported to do so was void, and the royal assent, which was given to that act, having nothing on which it could operate, was void also; as much so as it would have been if given to an act by which the Parliament had attempted to legislate for France or Italy. But the ratification of the treaty by the Scotch Parliament was the essential condition on which that of England ratified it. If therefore, the act of the Scotch Parliament was a nullity, so also must have been that which was only passed on the faith of its supposed validity. The one was the consideration for the other; and if England could receive nothing, neither could she mean to give, nor could give any thing; and the whole business resembled, on her part, what the lawyers call a *nudum pactum*.
Thus

Thus this doctrine necessarily leads to the inference, that the present Legislature of this country has no legitimate authority; that the powers it exercises are mere usurpation; and that no man, either in Scotland or England, is bound to submit to any of the laws which have been enacted for near a century.

2d. When, perceiving that this argument of acquiescence fails by leading to such a dangerous absurdity, Gentlemen resort to some supposed special delegation from the people or constituent body to the Parliament of Scotland, it will be recollected, as I have already shewn, that the electors *could not*, by the constitution—in this respect the same in that kingdom as in England—make any such delegation, so as to give it any force or validity; nor grant to the elected any peculiar powers, not incident to the mere character of representatives duly chosen. I will now prove, that in 1707 no such delegation *was in fact* attempted in Scotland.

There is undoubtedly a passage or two in *De Foe's History of the Union*, which seem to indicate something special in the appointment of the members of the Parliament of Scotland, which concluded that Treaty;* and a supposed specific authority, in that instance, though very little taken notice of in this House, has been much relied on in several speeches, and in various pamphlets, in the sister kingdom. This circumstance induced me to bestow some pains in the investigation of the matter, the result of which has been, as I was well persuaded it would be, what I have just asserted, that no such authority was

* *Stockdale's Edit.* p. 230, 289.

in contemplation, much less required or conferred, at the time of electing that Parliament.

Indeed it would have been very extraordinary if the case had turned out otherwise, no historian of that period, or who has written since, having ever mentioned or alluded to such a fact, if we except those short and obscure passages in *De Foe* to which I have referred.

Nay, farther, in the several treaties preceding that which so happily accomplished the object, from the accession of James the Sixth of Scotland to the crown of England downwards, no idea of the necessity, expediency, or, I may say, constitutionally speaking, of the possibility of such a reference to, and the delegation from the freeholders and burgeses,—forming themselves, as they must have done, into what, in the modern French vocabulary, would be called *primary assemblies*,—ever seems to have been entertained by any projector, politician, lawyer, member of parliament, minister, or sovereign whatever.

I will now, Sir, shortly state what really happened in Scotland on the occasion of the last and successful treaty.

The Convention Parliament, or Estates, which had been assembled in that country on the abdication, or forfeiture, of James, and had met early in 1689, continued undissolved through all the reign of King William, and were summoned to meet by Queen Anne on the 9th of June 1702, a few months after her accession. The anomalous formation of those Estates is well known; and it will not be pretended, that any measure of Union between the two kingdoms was, at the time of their nomination,

mination, either agitated by the represented, or given in charge to their representatives.

The sixth English Parliament of King William, which had been called by the usual process (no special authority being pretended as to England,) was sitting on Queen Anne's accession; and on the 6th of May, 1702^a had passed an act, enabling the Queen to appoint commissioners for treating of an Union between England and Scotland.

As soon as the Scotch Parliament met after King William's death, this circumstance was communicated to them in a letter from the Queen, and a similar measure, on their part, recommended; and, in consequence thereof, a like act was passed on the 23d of June 1702.^b

Commissioners were accordingly appointed on the part of each kingdom, and met at Westminster on the 27th of October 1702.

In the mean time the Scotch Parliament, or Convention, was prorogued (30th June,) and soon afterwards dissolved, as was the English Parliament on the 2d of July 1702. But the commissions were not to determine by this dissolution of the respective Parliaments, but to continue in force; and such treaty as the commissioners might conclude was to be ratified by the subsequent Parliaments of each kingdom.

From the above deduction it is clear, that if those commissioners had in fact proceeded to the conclusion of a treaty, no surmise could ever have been made, that

^a 1 Anne, cap. 14.

^b Scotch Acts 1st Parliament of Q. Anne, c. 7. p. 686.

on the part of Scotland any special mandate had served as a foundation for the powers exercised on the occasion.

A new Parliament was soon afterwards called, in the usual way, in England, and met on the 20th of October 1702, a week previous to the meeting of the commissioners.

On the 8th of September a royal proclamation was published in Scotland, containing the following words :

‘ Whereas the late Parliament of that our ancient kingdom of Scotland is by our authority dissolved, and considering that we are at present engaged in a *most just and necessary war* ; and that by acts passed both in the Parliament of England and Scotland we are empowered, and have accordingly nominated *commissioners to treat of an Union* betwixt these our kingdoms, and of other things, matters and causes relating thereto, conform to the tenours of the said acts, the conclusion of which Union to be established and ratified in both Parliaments, will undoubtedly conduce to the lasting peace and welfare of both kingdoms ; for which causes, and that we judge it necessary there should be a Parliament in being to meet on such occasions as may require it, we have thought fit to call a Parliament of that our kingdom, to meet at our city of Edinburgh on the 12th of November next.’

This passage, in an instrument of which, after a good deal of research, I have been furnished with a copy by the obliging attention of the gentleman who has the care of the public records at Edinburgh, is the only circumstance and source to which I can trace the supposition of the alleged special authority of which I have been

been speaking. I think it is no injustice to the Gentlemen who have pleaded that special authority, to suppose they had conceived it to rest upon some more solid and tenable ground. Indeed I have not met with any evidence that they, or any writer or compiler, on the present occasion, had taken the pains I have been prompted to do (in order to sift every point of this great question as thoroughly as I could,) with regard to the proceeding which may have given rise to the passages I have referred to in *De Foe*. But it is no wonder, the sort of argument there stated, is so loosely, generally, and shortly expressed, and that so little attention seems to have been paid to it at the time, or by that very historian—the only one, as I before observed, who has ever hinted at it. Was the mention made of the war, in the same proclamation, a special or necessary notice to the electors of Scotland to instruct their representatives how they were to act in the ensuing Parliament, as to granting or refusing supplies? If it had been all at once discovered, that all former Parliaments which had entertained the question of Union, had exceeded the power and authority incident to their constitution, would there not have been some more solemn and specific recital to that effect in the proclamation itself? Would that subject have been lumped, as it were, with so common and usual a cause for holding a Parliament as the circumstance of a war? Would not the proclamation have proceeded to give new and peculiar directions for the method of communicating to the electors, the notice, that they were to exercise a novel and extraordinary sort of deliberation, and to communicate a new power to the elected, not necessarily vested in them by the act of election and consequent commission, appointing them members of the Legislature? Would not the proceedings at the subsequent elections, the summons, the returns,

or,

as they were called, and were in fact in Scotland, the commissions of the persons chosen, have contained some reference to the subject? Would not the minutes of the election meetings, whether of counties or burghs, which in that country are drawn up with so much form and precision, have recorded the especial object and purpose for calling the Parliament, and the instructions on that account given by each body of constituents? Would there have been no trace of any thing of that sort among the entries in the corporation books of Edinburgh, or of the other cities, towns, and boroughs of the kingdom? Would there not have been some tradition, some memorial, some narrative, or some hint of a formal, or at least of some incidental allusion to the subject of Union at some of the elections? Of some contest founded on the known or declared opinions of different candidates, for or against the measure? And, lastly, would not the very act of the Scotch Parliament, which ratified the treaty, have recited the special power which alone warranted them in that act, and which their general character as a Parliament did not authorize?

Now, Sir, not one of those circumstances exists. The proclamation, the copy of which I hold in my hand, gives no particular direction as to the elections. The summonses for election, the commissions, the minutes, the corporation books, bear no marks or signs of any thing special. History, memoirs, tradition, are all silent; and you know, Sir, that the act of the Scotch Parliament is equally so.

It is hardly necessary to wind up the narrative I have been giving, by stating that the commissioners who met by virtue of the two acts of 1702, and of whom those
for

for Scotland must have been the only persons in the contemplation of the electors of the new Scotch Parliament, if those electors had exercised any judgment, as such, on the subject of the proposed Union, never came to any conclusive treaty or agreement. Their meetings were finally adjourned on the 3d of February 1703.

The new Scotch Parliament did not meet till the 6th of May 1703. On the 9th of September 1703, they voted, that *the commission of Parliament*, as they called it, was terminate and extinct; and that there should be no new one without the consent of Parliament.

In February 1704-5, the English Parliament passed a new act, empowering the Queen to appoint commissioners, when a similar act should have passed the Parliament of Scotland^a. On the 5th of April 1705, that first English Parliament of Queen Anne was dissolved, and the new one met on the 27th of October.

In the mean time, after a great deal of angry proceedings in the Parliament of Scotland, during their first and second session, in the third, which began on the 28th of June 1705, an act also passed, authorizing the Queen to appoint commissioners^b.

Under these two acts new commissions issued; that for Scotland on the 27th of February 1704-6, and that for England on the 10th of April 1706. The commissioners met at Whitehall on the 16th of that month; on the 22d of July, the articles were executed; on the 16th of January 1706-7, they were (with several alterations) ratified by an act of the Scotch Parliament; and on the 6th of

^a 3 and 4 Anne, cap 7.

^b Scotch Acts 1st Parl. of Q. Anne, 3d session, c. 4. p. 776.

March of the same year, by the English statute of 5th Anne, cap. 8. and the Union took effect on the 1st of May 1707.

Sir, I did in a prior debate^a, declining at that time the *argument*, which was in much better hands, advert to the *authority* of several eminent persons in Ireland on this question of the competency of their Parliament, and referred to a debate in the Irish House of Lords, in which the Lord Chancellor, the two Chief Justices, and the Chief Baron had voted, and three of them spoken in support of its competency. What I then said has been misunderstood. I have been supposed not only to have asserted what I have just mentioned, and (which I also admit I did) that Mr. *Foster* and Sir *John Parnell* had avoided giving their sanction to the contrary doctrine, but to have added, with some triumph and exultation, that there had nobody been found to maintain it, but *M'Nevin* and *Lewins*. Sir, that is not what I stated. I did perhaps discover the satisfaction I felt from the consideration that the distinguished characters I have mentioned had supported that side of the question which I thought was necessarily connected both with the general principles of government and those of the British Constitution; but I never said or meant to say, that no opinion had been delivered of an opposite sort, by any body in Ireland, except *M'Nevin* and *Lewins*. I merely observed that the names of those who, at the different county and other meetings which had then taken place, had come to resolutions denying the competency did not appear; and that I thought it right, in contrast with the learned Noblemen to

^a Monday, 11th February 1799.

whom I had referred, to mention two notorious persons in that kingdom, who had in their own names and characters pronounced boldly, and without hesitation, their authoritative opinion to that effect. It was therefore unnecessary to question me whether I did not know in particular that three considerable lawyers, and Members of the Irish Parliament, had denied this competency; and whether I doubted of their legal learning and abilities? I dare say they have denied it. I have indeed read in a printed letter, to which the name of one of those gentlemen is subscribed, ‘ That the Parliament of Ireland, true to itself and honest to its country, will never assume a power extrinsic of its delegation².’ Similar sentiments may have been delivered by the other two, and by others in the sister Parliament; and as to the legal abilities and acquirements of those gentlemen, far be it from me to express or entertain any opinion to their disparagement. One of them I have the pleasure of knowing; and that government, to which I had the honour of belonging when in Ireland, though so corrupt and wicked according to some of the Honourable Gentlemen on the opposite side of this House, had the advantage of receiving from him a most strenuous and spirited support. I do not recollect the other two. I believe they were not in Parliament in my time, but I understand they are also men of talents and eloquence. But, Sir, I am persuaded those gentlemen themselves would not think it implied any disrespect to them, as members of the profession to which I once had the honour to belong, if I were now to say, that the opinions of barristers, however able or eminent, are not, in point of authority, to be put in the balance, on a great constitutional point, with those of the heads of his Majesty’s supreme tribunals, the

² Mr. Barrington’s Letter to Mr. Saurin, dated 20th January 1799.

fathers and oracles of the law ; especially when those great judicial stations are so filled as they at present are.

But, is it true, that, with a disproportion of members, such as it may be supposed will be settled between the two countries, Ireland would only *give*, and Great Britain only *acquire* ? I speak now of legislative authority. In my judgment, quite otherwise. There would be a reciprocal, and, having regard to the respective weight of each in the scale of empire, an equal communication of power. The Lords and Commons of Great Britain would indeed acquire a direct share in the legislation of Ireland, but so would the Lords and Commons of Ireland in that of Great Britain. Mutually they would relinquish, or, if Gentlemen like a more exceptionable word better, would surrender, the exclusive jurisdiction over their respective countries ; but each would obtain a share, commensurate with its relative importance in the united state, of the supreme dominion over the whole ; and, therefore, as to the distinction attempted on the question of right, how can it be contended that the British Parliament may lawfully receive within its bosom, say 80, 100, or 120 strangers, vesting them individually with the same authority as its original members individually possessed, if the Irish Parliament cannot, on the condition of participating, according to due proportion, in the government of Great Britain and the empire, lawfully admit the legislators of this island and of the empire to a share, adjusted by the same rule of proportion, in the local government of Ireland ? The idea that inequality of numbers would vitiate the transaction on the side of the weakest country, leads to this (as was well remarked by a Right Honourable Gentleman,

Gentleman, in one of the more early debates^a), that there could never be a lawful Union, unless the numbers in the united legislature were made correctly and arithmetically equal on both sides. If so, had England agreed to the unreasonable demand, during the last century, on the part of Scotland^b, of joining the two Parliaments according to their then existing numbers, or were Great Britain now to receive into her House of Commons, all the 300 representatives of Ireland, and to unite together the two Houses of Peers as they now stand, the transaction would still have no legal solidity; the Scotch Parliament formerly, and the Irish Parliament now, would still have betrayed their trusts.

But this junction of the Parliaments, this identification or incorporation of the two Houses of each, in analogy to the identity which already exists as to the third estate, is treated as a destruction, an extinction, an utter annihilation of the constitution of Ireland. The same terms were misapplied in Scotland to the Union of that country with this; for, ingenious and inventive in arguments on most subjects as some of our opponents are, they will give me leave to say, that on many of the points of this question, they appear to me mere plagiarists, to a degree of servility, not only of the topics, but, in general, even of the very language and expressions which were then employed. Of this any man may convince himself by comparing the late debates here and elsewhere, with the History of *De Foe*, and the Memoirs of *Lockhart*.

In the case of Scotland and England the misapplication was not so great. In that case, the third branch of

^a Mr. D. Ryder.

^b In 1670.

each Legislature, though for the time it centred in the same person, was so far from being inseparably mixed, so as to form one indivisible whole, that a law actually existed^a, by which its separation, at no distant period, into two distinct sovereignties, was expressly established.

It were to be wished that Gentlemen would explain what that essential part of the constitution of Ireland is, which the incorporation of its Lords and Commons with ours will annihilate. It has always appeared to me that in two principles is comprehended the essence of ours and of the Irish constitution, which, with the exception of certain abuses, real or imputed, of different sorts, to be found in each kingdom, is one and the same. How often have I heard Gentlemen in the Irish Parliament boast that they enjoyed, how often read in the published harangues and essays of Irish politicians, their exultation in the possession of the British constitution ! I say, I have always conceived that the most essential principles of that constitution are two: 1. That it is composed of three independent estates or branches, forming checks each upon the other two. 2. That no law can pass, affecting the life, the liberty or property of the subject, without the concurrence of a representative body chosen from among the people, in a mode formed on the consideration of property and franchise, and consisting of an adequate number of persons; and of such a mixed description, as to bring to the legislative assemblies competent knowledge, both of general and local concerns, and a sympathy of interest in regard to every thing that can affect their constituents and the nation at large.

^a The Scotch Act of Anne, called the Act of Security, 1st Parliament of Queen Anne, 2d Sess. c. 3. p. 723.

Now, Sir, if this description is in any degree true, how can it be said, that the combining into one supreme Imperial Council a just number of the representatives of both nations for one House, and of the Peers for the other, will be the annihilation of the constitution? The Legislature of the empire may, in my opinion, in one point of view, and that perhaps the most enlarged and the soundest, be considered as one great political machine; consisting of one and the same supreme head, both executive and legislative; to which are attached, or linked and knit, two separate members, while each of those two is subdivided again into two analogous parts: the one member, the Lords and Commons of Great Britain, empowered to prepare for the Sovereign's deliberation, sanction, or rejection, whatever may seem necessary for Great Britain, and for the empire at large: the other, the Lords and Commons of Ireland, possessing only, but exclusively—as far as such exclusion is consistent with the idea of an unity of empire, either on the present or any other possible frame of such a machine—the same power as to the kingdom of Ireland. Let me ask, whether this machine, considered theoretically at least, would not be simplified, its structure improved, and the two essential objects I have pointed out, better secured, by blending and incorporating, in a fit proportion, the two separate members into one?

But,

But, Sir, after making the best stand they can on this quicksand of incompetency, the Gentlemen proceed to the real merits of the question, and expressly deny that Ireland will reap any benefit from the measure; meaning, I suppose, also to deny, that it will prove beneficial to this country, or to the empire at large. I suppose they mean this, because I cannot think that any man of good sense, or who is a real friend to Ireland, can disjoin her interests from those of this kingdom, and of the other parts of the British dominions, or contend that any great arrangement is unadvisable and unjust, which shall tend to the general advantage of those other branches of the empire, merely because no particular advantage may accrue to Ireland, provided that country is not thereby exposed to some detriment or danger.

Let us therefore examine a few of the most prominent circumstances of advantage which may be reasonably expected to flow from a Union, in the first place, *to Great Britain*, and *to the rest of his Majesty's dominions*; but, secondly, *to Ireland*;—considering the subject in a general view of legislative and executive government, of commerce, manufactures, and agriculture, of internal peace, civilization, and prosperity: under which heads we may also discuss some of the principal objections which have been relied on, either here or in the sister country.

With regard to *this country*, its legislative and executive councils would no longer be liable to be perplexed in consequence of the distinct machinery of a separate Irish Parliament, nor the general government continue
in

in constant danger of misapprehension and disputes, and subject to the inconveniences which inevitably arise from circuitry of communication, and the impediments and embarrassing modifications to which jealousy or ignorance on the one side or the other will so often give occasion (while things remain as they are), in many of the most important concerns of the empire.

In other respects it may be difficult to foresee any immediate advantage to Great Britain; to her manufactures, her agriculture, her trade, or general prosperity. Some people, indeed, rather apprehend danger to British commerce and manufactures; and that supposed migration of capital and skill to a cheaper country, to a country possessing a superiority of situation as to many branches of business which has been often the subject of public discussion, is argued upon as a too probable consequence of a Union^a. To this it might be a sufficient answer for the statesman to say, that if what one part of the united kingdom shall lose another will gain, there will be no public detriment to the whole. But that answer, I own, sounds harsh to my ears. I think you ought not, on such general considerations of policy, to overlook the feelings and interests of the numerous individuals and classes of men, who have, as it were, localized their ingenuity, their industry, their wealth, and their habits of life, under the countenance and implied faith of pre-existing laws and institutions. There is a better answer, I believe, in the fact, that capital and industry so localized are not easily influenced at once to change their situation, by such temptations. The attempts which have been made, at various times, to transfer, by some sudden effort of speculation and enterprise, English money and credit, and

^a Mr. Peel's Speech.

English art and skill, to cheaper and more eligible places in Scotland, Wales, and even Ireland, have rarely been successful, or persevered in; and it is no inconsiderable illustration and proof of this position, that, even with regard to external trade, which is certainly more locomotive than manufactures, those towns and ports where accident at first, and a long series of causes afterwards, have operated to establish it, are seldom or ever out-rivalled, or their commerce drawn off, by any exertions however powerful in favour of situations better adapted by nature for carrying it on.

Gradually, however, after a Union, Ireland will undoubtedly attract much wealth, capital, and credit from this country, not only by the circumstances of advantage to which I have alluded, but also, more especially, because an uniformity of laws and legislature will give greater confidence to those who may be disposed to embark in enterprises of speculation, or place their money on commercial or landed securities in that kingdom. This, one should think, would be a strong and reasonable argument with Ireland (of which afterwards); but such gradual benefit to be reaped by her, will not affect the interests of individuals now engaged in business here, and will unquestionably, from the known principles and history of public wealth, tend in its progress, by multiplying intercourse, and the returns of profit in and between both countries, to increase the riches of both, and of the whole empire.

Let us now give a moment's consideration to the effects of the proposed Union on that *empire*, as an aggregate

gate of which, Great Britain and Ireland form the two chief and preponderating members.

And here, Sir, it will be enough just to observe, what no man, I think, can deny, that in all cases where it is practicable, one general, superintending, and controlling legislature, is the best fitted for the steady, consistent, and rational government of all the parts of that combination of individuals and territories which constitutes what is denominated a state.

To endeavour to enforce this position by a long train of argument, indisputable as I conceive it to be, would be an unwarrantable waste of time and words.

It has indeed been said, in answer to those who have pointed out the obvious inconvenience which might arise from a difference of opinion on any great imperial question, as of peace and war, between two distinct Parliaments, that equal inconvenience would follow from a difference of a like sort between the several branches of the same Parliament; but that such differences, though they may be suggested by theory, have not been found to happen in practice^b. I must beg leave to say that they certainly sometimes have happened, both between the two Houses, and between those Houses and the Sovereign, in the British Parliament, and with the hazard, at least, of considerable detriment to the state. But there are material distinctions between the two cases which have been thus brought into comparison. The identity of interest between the several branches of the legislative and executive government of the same country is much more direct and sensible, and therefore, on discussion, much less apt to be mistaken by either,

^b Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 54, 55.

than what exists between two kingdoms, though forming parts of the same empire. Besides, there is a facility of discussion and explanation, by conference, address, remonstrance, &c. between the respective branches of the same Parliament, which cannot take place between two distinct Legislatures.

It is also said, that the checks which the proceedings of the three branches of the same Parliament produce, furnish a principle to which our constitution owes its stability, and that similar checks exist between the two sister Parliaments^b. No doubt this is true to a certain extent; but it would be easy to shew, that in the case of the two Parliaments such checks exist in a very imperfect degree, without any foundation in their formal and legal constitutions^c, and with little more force or efficacy, than those which prevail in the relations of different states, having common interests, but no link or connexion in their governments. Such checks between the different nations of our part of the globe contributed for a time to maintain what used to be called the balance of Europe; but although those of a more substantial and operative kind, in concurrence with other causes, have to this day preserved, and, I trust, if perpetuity can belong to human institutions, will ever preserve our frame of government, the other and inferior sort has not been found of equal power in giving permanency to that balance.

^b Mr. *Foster's* Speech, p. 55.

^c This is not inconsistent with what is afterwards said of the jurisdiction the British Parliament may exercise over the executive ministers who advise the King in assenting to, or rejecting Irish bills. That jurisdiction is without power to stop such assent or rejection; and, therefore, forms no immediate or absolute check, though it may afterwards punish those who have advised the Crown to give or refuse its assent.

I admit that circumstances of distance (there may be others) are sometimes such as to render so desirable an object as one common imperial legislature impracticable. Such I take to have been the case with regard to our colonies in North America. I believe all sober men of all parties, both here and on that continent, would have agreed, that, could it have been done, the admission into the British Parliament of an adequate number of representatives from thence, would have been the happiest method of reconciling the disputes and removing the difficulties which terminated in a civil war, and the separation of that country from the empire. Dr. *Adam Smith*, and many others, recommended the experiment. The immense distance, and the uncertainty of regular, periodical, frequent, and early communication between American representatives in Great Britain and their constituents in America, seem to me to have opposed insurmountable obstacles to such a plan.

But that no valid objection of a like nature exists in the case of Ireland, is, I think, abundantly manifest. Some gentlemen, indeed, of that country have expressed, in very strong language, their ideas of the inconvenience which would attend what they quaintly term a *transmarine* Parliament; and one learned barrister, at the celebrated meeting of the profession which took place early in Dublin, is stated to have pronounced, ‘ That a British Minister shall not, and cannot, plant another Sicily in the bosom of the Atlantic, and that God and nature never intended that Ireland should be a province^d.’

If by this is meant, that the intervening channel is, in the nature of things, an insuperable difficulty in the way

^d Debates of the Irish Bar, 9th December 1798, p. 47.

of a legislative Union ; I answer, that in principle (however widely the cases differ in importance) the reason would equally apply to the islands of Orkney and Shetland, and would have applied, in former times, to the town of Calais. As to the idea, that Ireland, by a Union, will, in any degrading or offensive sense of the word, become a province, in any other sense than that according to which she and Great Britain are now provinces of the general empire ; I deny it. Ireland, indeed, will no longer be a distinct kingdom ; but neither will Great Britain : they will both become, as it were, *aliquot* parts of one incorporated realm, instead of remaining separate *integral* parts of the empire.

It is true, that the interposition of the sea forms a geographical separation between them, which did not exist in the case of England and Scotland. But, on the other hand, Dublin is nearer to London than Edinburgh is ; and the journey, notwithstanding the sea passage, is, I believe, in general, performed in a shorter time ; Cork, Limeric, and Londonderry, the most distant considerable cities in Ireland, from the British metropolis, are nearer to it than several of the principal towns in the north of Scotland ; and no part of Ireland is so far removed from this city as the counties of Sutherland and Caithness ; not to mention again the Orkney and the Shetland Islands.

Besides, it is to be observed, that Great Britain is the *only* neighbour of Ireland, and that while the eastern coast of Scotland is open to a near and easy intercourse with other countries, Great Britain intercepts almost entirely all direct communication between Ireland and the continent of Europe, while the immense expanse of the Atlantic divides that island from all other parts of the globe.

If we add to these considerations the many and important facilities, or rather invitations, to a more thorough incorporation of England and Ireland—and which now must comprehend Scotland—that did not exist in the former case; the same system of laws, civil and commercial; the same rules of property; similar tribunals; corresponding forms of legislature; a common origin; extensive consanguinity, and intermarriages; the great number of those who, by succession or acquisition, are daily becoming owners of land in both kingdoms; the same established religion; the same course of education, &c. &c.—If we consider all these circumstances, that of absolute territorial contiguity seems to be infinitely outweighed, and, as it were, totally to vanish from our sight.

Having incidentally cleared away, as I flatter myself I have, this objection of the want of immediate juxtaposition, I shall not, for the present, revert to any farther examination of more general, or, as they are often called, imperial considerations; but will now proceed to take a view of some of the peculiar benefits which I think *Ireland* would derive from the proposed arrangement.

At present, she has no share whatever in the legislation of Great Britain, nor, as I have always heard admitted, in that of the empire. Her Parliament can take no part in the regulations necessary for the government and administration of our foreign possessions in the East and West Indies, in Asia, Africa, or America, of those in the Mediterranean, or even of those in her own immediate neighbourhood, in St. George's Channel, or on the western coast of France. Is any one so ignorant as not to perceive how materially
such

such regulations may affect the commercial and political interests of Ireland ?

On the admission of her representatives among those of this island, she will immediately acquire her proportionate share in all those great concerns ; a voice in the legislative government of Great Britain, and of every part of the British dominions.

This is not all : Ireland will not only have this share of general legislation, through the influence and suffrages of her own immediate representatives ; she will also be represented and entitled to speak through the influence and suffrages of every one of the 513 members chosen in this island. This was ably pointed out in a former debate, by a Gentleman who, on that occasion, discovered the most enlarged and liberal views of general policy, united to the soundest speculative as well as practical knowledge of commerce and manufacture^b.

And here we may perceive the gross fallacy of the idea which so often mixes itself in these debates, and has, as we have seen, been founded on the argument of incompetency ; viz. that the concerns of Ireland will be solely and exclusively attended to, and this too on a principle of opposition and hostility, by the smaller number of members which she will have to choose. It will, on the contrary, be then the duty, and on all great points will, I am satisfied, be the desire and the true interest of those elected here, to give their due weight to the interests, general or local, of Ireland, in their deliberations and in their votes ; and in other cases I am apt to believe, what respects Ireland will be wholly left to the decision of the Irish mem-

^b Mr. Pecke.

bers, as I have already observed to have happened so generally in regard to the Scotch members of the British Parliament, when the subject before the Legislature has merely related to Scotland. Natural and fair reasons for this, and equally applicable to Ireland, might easily be stated; but it is enough here to appeal to the fact, which has been so notorious, that when my Right Honourable Friend asked in a former debate, whether Scotland had, in consequence of her comparatively small number of forty-five members, been oppressed or taxed beyond her proportion since the Union? the mere supposition, so contrary to experience, forced a smile from the Gentlemen on the other side of the House.

But, as I have just said, *every* individual in the united Parliament, will in principle, and as a duty, have vested in him a portion of British and also a portion of Irish representation, and this, in the ratio of the comparative weight and importance of the two countries in the general scale. And let not Gentlemen pay so poor a compliment to the candour and wisdom of British Legislators as to think they will either supinely or partially shut out from their minds important objects which may more immediately concern Ireland, but the decision on which cannot but also affect the welfare of the whole united kingdom. Many, indeed, chosen for Great Britain will feel even personal motives as strong or stronger for looking to the advantage of Ireland as for consulting that of this country. Have we, for instance, any reason to suppose that the Honourable Member for Stafford, if he should happily fail, as I trust he will, in the object of his present mistaken zeal, and the Union should be established, will be a less vigilant guardian of the privileges and interests of his native land, than of those of
the

the country he has thought fit to adopt? or will a native of Great Britain, if he happens also to be a merchant principally engaged in Irish commerce, and looking to that country as the source of his wealth and fortune; while the opulent English mortgagee of an estate in Ireland (of which description some, I believe, have now seats in this House) will men of that sort, members chosen for British seats, to the united Parliament, be apt to overlook that part of their duty which they will owe to the sister island? Such Gentlemen are even now prompt enough, and I mention it to their honour, to speak as if they represented Ireland here. But, as matters stand, they can hardly do so constitutionally, and certainly not effectually. If a Union take place, such a conduct will be at once reconcilable to their inclination, their rights, and their duty.

Sir, it has been a very common objection in Ireland to measures affecting that country undertaken by the government here, that ministers in London, with all the opportunities their stations may furnish, and their sense of duty urge them to improve, have not the means of acquiring such an habitual and detailed knowledge of the characters, circumstances, and interests of that kingdom, as would have been necessary to enable them to have judged with sufficient certainty of the justice or policy of such measures. I do not mean here to refer to those persons in that kingdom who have borrowed from the phraseology of their predecessors in Scotland the inflammatory and inapplicable terms of *foreign* government, *foreign* cabinet, *foreign* ministers, &c. I speak of many men firmly attached to the connexion with Britain and the interests of the empire, and who consider Irishmen and Britons not as foreigners to each other,
but

but as friends and countrymen, living under the allegiance of the same sovereign, and entitled reciprocally to all the privileges—I was going to say of *citizenship*, but that word has been profaned,—of natural born-subjects, in either kingdom. Men even of that description are not unfrequently heard to say, ‘ The government in England is ‘ unacquainted with the concerns and the people of this ‘ country. They seldom interfere without doing harm. ‘ Why do they not leave us to ourselves ?’

It is needless to argue the obvious inadmissibility of the conclusion thus drawn from premises concerning the truth of which it is not my business to inquire. The administrators of the supreme superintending government of the empire, in all its parts, must reside near the person of the Sovereign. But though we cannot give way to the principle, it does not follow that the facts may not, in some instances, have proved more or less true.

Now, Sir, the incorporation of the legislatures would, I think, by the frequent presence of the Irish Peers and Commoners at the seat of general government, afford a perfect cure to this evil. Men thoroughly acquainted with all the affairs of that kingdom; natives, probably, of all or most of the different cities and counties; persons possessing property, engaged in trade and manufactures, or exercising professions over the whole extent of the country, would be then, during the sitting of Parliament, ready on the spot to represent to the Ministers, or even submit directly to the Sovereign, and when the occasion called on them, in the different stages of any measure, or on the first pressure of any emergency, would have it in their power to bring before the eyes of the imperial Legislature itself, and support in both Houses, by their weight, their talents, and
G
their

their suffrages, whatever their duty to their country, or to their immediate constituents, might seem to require.

But the most seducing topic with the vulgar, and with some also in Ireland of a higher class who possess a stronger sense than understanding of national dignity and honour, has been the independence of their country. This is represented as so inseparably connected with the Parliament they now enjoy, that when the mode of their legislation shall be changed, and they shall cease to have this Parliament exclusively their own, they imagine the nation must cease to be independent, and that they will become a debased and degraded people. Sir, when such a change as is proposed, is considered as a degradation and debasement, it certainly must arise from some confusion in the ideas annexed to those words.

If Ireland and its Parliament shall be incorporated with the British nation and Parliament, they will undoubtedly lose their distinctness and identity. They will no longer have a separate political existence; they will become, but so will Great Britain and her Parliament, parts only of the united whole; and in as far as a part cannot be said to be independent of the other parts, Ireland will, in that sense, become dependent on Great Britain, but so will Great Britain on Ireland. If after this it shall be contended that the lesser part is more dependent than the greater, the argument will be found to resolve itself into what we have already discussed, namely, the effects of the disproportion of numbers between the Irish and British members of the common Parliament.

May I, however, be permitted to ask whether the Irish Parliament, even since the boasted revolution or constitution

tion of 1782, is, or ever can, in its separate, yet connected state, be totally independent? I know, Sir, that this may be reckoned delicate ground, but it has been, unguardedly I think, resorted to by the enemies of a Union, and I but follow them in entering upon it; and, besides, I feel too strongly the ties of duty and affection by which I hold myself to be connected with that country as well as this, to avoid any part of the argument, which has been rendered necessary to a sound decision, merely because, if ill understood, what I may say upon it may prove unpopular in the neighbouring kingdom. In such circumstances *maluerim veris offendere quam placere adulando*.

Is then a Parliament independent, whose proceedings cannot receive the force of law without the act of persons not members of that Parliament in any of its branches, and who, in acting or refusing to act in that respect, are themselves responsible to another Parliament? Yet that this is the very condition and state of the Irish Parliament is clear from the statute-book of Ireland; and indeed its being so is fondly considered by some of the most able, though, alas! also most prejudiced opposers of a Union, as essential to the happy connexion of that country with this. ‘The statute (Irish St. 20 & 22 Geo. III. c. 47.) enacts, that no bill shall pass into a law in Ireland, unless it be returned under the Great Seal of Great Britain; thus not leaving the connexion of the two kingdoms a bare junction under one sovereign, but securing the continuance of that connexion, by making the British minister answerable to the British nation’ (i. e. the British Parliament), ‘if any law should receive the royal assent in Ireland which could in any way injure the empire,

‘pire, be incompatible with its imperial interests, or tend
 ‘to separate Ireland from it^b.’

To analyse this matter more in detail. The Great Seal of Great Britain cannot be put to an Irish bill but by the Chancellor or Lord Keeper of that seal, who will seldom execute this duty of his office without the concurrence of those other Ministers of State, members of the British Council, who constitute what is called the Cabinet. Every act so done, though under the command of the King, is an executive, not a legislative act, which the Minister advises and performs at his peril, liable to be called to account for it by impeachment in this Parliament. His Majesty’s personal expression of his assent to an Irish statute is perhaps as purely legislative as that by which he assents to a British law; but every public act done by a subject, except his speaking and voting in Parliament, is in its nature executive, and that for which he is responsible. In the sentence I just now took the liberty to repeat, there seems to be implied some notion or suggestion that the responsibility of the British Ministers is confined to the case of Irish statutes affecting the empire at large, or tending to a separation of the two kingdoms. The Irish act referred to, says no such thing. It is indeed very common to hear a distinction made between acts of the Irish Parliament concerning the local policy and interests of that kingdom, and those whose objects are imperial. In a popular sense, and in extreme cases, such a distinction no doubt exists. A road or estate bill in Ireland can hardly, by any possibility, concern the empire at large; and it might be folly in a British Chancellor or Cabinet to exercise any judgment, or apprehend any responsibility,

^b Mr. Foster’s Speech, p. 24.

in regard to it. But the law draws no line, and in every Irish statute of any considerable moment the empire must be more or less concerned. Who is to judge of the degree in which it is so, or of the propriety and safety of advising his Majesty to receive or reject any such statute? who but the Minister or Ministers who may be questioned for giving that advice, and carrying it into effect? a question which any member for any county or borough in this kingdom may stir whenever he pleases. I must therefore ask again, whether this does not prove that there still remains not a shadowy, but a real and substantial subordination or dependence of the Irish on the British Parliament; a dependence or subordination inherent in the very nature of the present mode of connexion between the two countries^b.

^b The following passage will be found entirely to agree with what is above stated: 'I do not hesitate to say, that in thus rendering the Great Seal of Britain necessary to the passing an Irish law, if we created a theoretic difference in the constitution of the two kingdoms, which renders ours *inferior*, it is one not injurious to us, but *necessary from our situation in the empire**.' To some of the concluding part of the same paragraph I can by no means assent, *viz.* 'And one with which we are content, and *which secures Union and connexion on a firm and lasting basis*.' The person whose words these are, and most of the friends of Great Britain in Ireland, may be content with the inferiority he mentions, or at least prefer it to the misfortune of separation; but how it should be thought that a mere act of the Irish Parliament, which may be repealed as it was enacted, can secure a lasting Union and connexion, especially with our late experience of the alarming exertions of so many enemies of Great Britain, at home and abroad, to destroy that connexion, is really matter of surprise. Is the Irish act of 21 & 22. Geo. III. 'a *parchment roll*' of greater and more permanent force and virtue than a treaty of Union, ratified by both Legislatures, would be?

* Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 24.

† Ibid. p. 51, 63.

With regard to the executive government, its subordination is still more obvious. The King's solemn commands, to be executed in Ireland, are either communicated to the Lord Lieutenant when he enters upon his office by his commission and general instructions under the seals of Great Britain, or by King's letters, transmitted from time to time, and countersigned by one of the Secretaries of State, or, in revenue matters, by the Lord Treasurer or three of the Lords of the Treasury. This course of business, if I recollect rightly, is reported to have been stated nearly as I have taken the liberty of doing, by a distinguished Peer of both kingdoms, in the Irish House of Lords, about a year ago^b.

What is the consequence of all this? Ireland is still jealous of her independency. We are told by many, that she conquered that independency, and will maintain it by the sword: she therefore revolts at the practical exercise of powers constitutionally vested in the Parliament and Ministers of this country. The government here, partly from the fear of renewing former or exciting new animosities, partly from other causes, are supposed in general cases to leave matters to the Irish Parliament, and the Ministers of that country. From time to time, however, points will occur where there may appear strong and cogent reasons for their exercising their own judgment and discretion, and this perhaps in a manner contrary to the sentiments prevailing with the servants of the Crown in Ireland. In such cases the difficulty may often be surmounted by the prudence of confidential intercourse, and the adoption of some middle way, suggested by good temper and good

^b The Earl of *Muir*. Report of the Debate on his Lordship's motion, 19th February 1798, p. 46.

sense on the one side and the other, so as not to alarm the dignity of Ireland, or commit the imperial authority resident here. But more than once, even since I have had my attention directed to Irish affairs, situations have arisen in which the English Ministry have thought it their duty (whether they were right or wrong on those particular occasions, is not now the point) to exercise, without such a temperance, an immediate controuling authority in Ireland. Now, Sir, whenever this has happened they have incurred more than the hazard of rousing the jealousy, and affronting the high spirit of some of those persons in that kingdom who had been accustomed to a leading share in the measures of her government, and may think they are conscious to themselves of a superior knowledge of her affairs.

Here then is a dilemma which has already occasioned many difficulties, and which, unless some remedy can be applied, and some alteration take place, will, I fear, in future, be the source of growing embarrassment to both governments, and much ill blood between the two countries; nor can I see the possibility of any alteration which can have the effect of a remedy whilst the present system remains. His Majesty, in order to exercise his legislative and executive functions, must either go to Ireland; or he must exercise them through the medium of servants, responsible and impeachable here; or Ireland, by its representatives, must come to England. The first of these plans would only remove the difficulty as to Ireland by throwing it upon Great Britain; and besides, the residence of the King of the British dominions any where but in Great Britain will hardly be proposed. The second we have shewn to be incompatible with the real independency of Irish legislative and executive government. The third,
therefore,

therefore, only remains; i. e. such a legislative Union and incorporation, as that the Irish nation shall be represented in this country by an adequate number of Lords and Commoners, returned to serve at Westminster in a common or united Parliament. Then, indeed, it will be no longer true of Ireland, that she ‘ must tamely follow Great Britain with submission and subserviency;’ then she will be no longer *gens quæ juxta jacet, dubiæ libertatis*; the country and its legislation will then, by their identification with this, be truly independent. They never can be so otherwise, unless Ireland will separate herself from Great Britain, and can trust to her own strength and means in resisting, or to the liberality of our enemies in not attempting to impose upon her the yoke of a government really foreign.

Having said so much on the topics of general policy, in respect to legislation and executive government, I will now, with the leave of the House, examine this question of Union, as it may affect the interests of Ireland in her trade, manufactures, and agriculture; interests which, when rightly understood, mutually assist each other, and which may be considered together, being liable in most instances to be improved or injured by the same causes.

The advocates against a Union have used much subtlety, though, in general, little method or order, in arguing this part of the subject. As far as I have been able to arrange what they have said, they seem to contend that Ireland is now in a most flourishing situation, and in a state of progressive improvement; that she owes this, in the first place, to a compact under which her linen trade has been cultivated with the most happy success; and in the next, to that more solemn compact with Great Britain, ‘ the
‘ glorious

‘ glorious constitution of 1782,’ which enabled her to legislate for herself, and secure, protect, and cherish by her own vigilant attention to the great objects of her prosperity, that trade, and all the other branches of her commerce, her manufactures, and her agriculture.

These compacts they treat as binding and complete. They cannot be departed from, and nothing farther is wanting to the growing prosperity and safety of Ireland. But a Union would annul them, would shake or destroy every security which they have established, and would substitute in their place, the capricious, selfish, and despotic will of an unjust, narrow-minded, and rapacious rival. These, perhaps, are not the words, but I think they express, and do not exaggerate the meaning of what has been frequently and very recently insisted upon.

Let us therefore a little inquire, but, as far as we can, with moderation and temper, the best companions of reason and justice, how these different allegations stand in point of fact. And first, as to the supposed compact concerning the linen trade.

It is admitted that Great Britain is the great customer of Ireland for that her staple commodity ; that we receive it for our home consumption free of all duty ; and encourage its re-exportation from hence to foreign parts by the same bounties which we bestow on our own manufacture. This, I say, is admitted ; but,—besides endeavouring to extenuate the merit which it is feared this country might lay claim to for the liberality of such conduct, by the hackneyed answer, that she, like other states and nations under like circumstances, is governed in her transactions with Ireland, merely by the impression of her own benefit

and advantage—it is stated, ‘ That this encouragement to the Irish linen trade is the effect of a special contract, by which, for a valuable consideration, England became bound to grant and maintain it. The valuable consideration was, the relinquishment by Ireland of her woollen export trade, in which she had or might have become a dangerous rival. England had grown jealous of this rivalry; her manufacturers and her Parliament had urged King William to check it; he had consented, and had expressed that consent in terms justly offensive to Ireland; a negotiation ensued; and acts of each of the two Parliaments passed, by which Ireland engaged to withdraw from all competition as to woollen goods, on the condition, that England would give that preference and assistance, which she does, to the linen manufactory of Ireland; in consequence of this treaty, the woollen fabrics, of which she at that time exported to the amount of 110,000*l.* a year, were abandoned; they cannot be resumed; and therefore Great Britain cannot recall or cancel that obligation by which she engaged herself to promote, in the manner alleged, the linen trade of that country.’ Such is in substance the statement made.

It is extraordinary, but true, that since these debates began, many persons, not ill informed in matters of this sort, and anxious to obtain correct information on the point now in question, have avowed their ignorance, and unsuccessful endeavours to obtain the knowledge of the documents and acts in which this supposed compact is contained, of its date, particular clauses and provisions, and of the sanctions, whether of a statutable or diplomatic nature, by which it was guarded. But what I have

^a *Qu.* Why?

to

to add, is still more extraordinary, and equally true, namely, that, such as it was, it no longer exists, but was done away, and totally and entirely repealed and made void, many years ago, at the instance of Ireland herself; and that the advantages which Great Britain still confers on the linen trade of Ireland, are, on her part, at the present hour, merely voluntary, whatever may be the motives of generosity, policy, or self-interest, which induce her to continue them.

For my own part, I confess that I know of no satisfactory evidence of agreements or compacts between nations, except what are to be found in their diplomatic or legislative records. Between nations totally distinct, they must, to have substantial validity, be expressed in the stipulations of mutual and solemn treaties, duly executed; between countries connected as Ireland and England were, and as Ireland and Great Britain are, by acts of their respective Legislatures, passed with relation express or implied each to the other, so as that the act on the one side shall be the condition and consideration of that on the other side. I have accordingly endeavoured to trace the history of the business I am now discussing, in those sure, and only sure, repositories of the national transactions of both countries with each other—their respective statute-books;—and the correct result appears to me to be as follows:

Restrictive taxes had been laid long ago back as the period of the Edwards, on the importation of woollen goods into this kingdom, whether from Ireland or any other country beyond seas. But not to go back to any earlier period than the Restoration, by the act of 12 Car. II. c. 4. s. 1. 8s. 6d. per yard were imposed on all woollen cloths.

cloths, and 1*s.* 3*d.* on woollen stuffs^a, imported into England. These last-mentioned duties have never been repealed. They have indeed been increased to 1*l.* 17*s.* 5*d.* per yard on cloth, and 5*s.* 6*d.* on stuffs, by the operation of new and general subsidies, affecting them in common with all other articles of importation. But the duty of 8*s.* 6*d.* per yard alone amounted, and would of itself still amount, to an entire prohibition; for neither Ireland nor any country on earth could come in competition with this in her home market, if burdened with that duty. Thus stood the law at the period when the supposed bargain took place. The House will see that England did not then want the concurrence of Ireland, nor had any occasion to purchase that concurrence by any concession on her part, in order to exclude Irish woollens from her own home market.

But it seems the English Legislature and Government of that time thought it good policy to listen to the representations, made by the English manufacturers, of the danger their staple trade was exposed to from the competition of the Irish in foreign countries. The Irish Parliament, on the other hand, seem to have been satisfied, that it was upon the whole for the interest of their country, to obtain the favour and protection of England to her linen manufactures, which had been even then carried to a considerable height, by an amicable understanding, and the relinquishment of that hostile competition in the woollen business abroad, which had occasioned so much ill-humour on this side of the water.

^a Note.—The duty was 12*d.* in the pound, or 5 per cent. on the value, as valued in the book of rates; and cloths were rated so high as 8*l.* 10*s.* per yard, stuffs at 1*l.* 5*s.*

Accordingly

Accordingly they passed a law, in the 10th year of William III.^b, imposing an *ad valorem* duty of 4s. in the pound on all broad cloth, and 2s. in the pound on ferges, baize, &c. exported from Ireland to any part of the world. This amounted in effect to a prohibition; but no act was passed in England on the occasion, to check or prohibit the exportation of English linens. Will it be said, Ireland had reason to expect such a law to pass? where is the evidence of this?

The English House of Lords, in an address to the Throne, had indeed pressed the King to declare, ‘ that
 ‘ if the woollen trade were relinquished in Ireland, and
 ‘ the subjects there should turn their industry and skill to
 ‘ the settling and improving the linen manufacture, for
 ‘ which generally the lands of that kingdom were very
 ‘ proper, they should receive all favour, countenance,
 ‘ and protection from his royal influence for the encouragement and promoting of the said linen manufacture,
 ‘ to all the advantage and profit that kingdom could be
 ‘ capable of.’

The English Commons, in like manner, had implored the King to ‘ make it his royal care to discourage the
 ‘ woollen, and encourage the linen manufacture in Ireland, to which they said they should always be ready to
 ‘ give their utmost assistance.’

And the King, in answer to this address of the Com-

^a Irish Statutes, 10 Will. III. c. 5.

^b Journals of the House of Lords, vol. xvi. p. 314. 9th June 1698.

^c Journals of the House of Commons, vol. xii. p. 337. 30th June 1698.

mons, had said, ‘ I will do all that in me lies to discourage
 ‘ the woollen manufacture in Ireland, and encourage the
 ‘ linen manufacture there^b.’

It was after this that the Irish act I have just mentioned
 passed.

The English laws at that time as to Irish linen stood
 thus: by the 7th and 8th William III. c. 39. Irish linen
 was made importable into England duty free; but a new
 subsidy of 5 per cent. on all goods imported, having been
 granted in the year after (8th and 9th William III. c. 24.)
 to continue till the 1st of February 1699, without any
 exception as to Irish linen, that article became liable to
 this new duty; and from the state of the war in 1698, it
 was probable that this subsidy would be renewed, as it
 accordingly was from time to time, and continued for the
 life of Queen Anne; it may therefore be conjectured that
 the great wish of Ireland as to her linen trade then was,
 a restoration to the exemption granted by the first-men-
 tioned act, so as again to open a free market for her linens
 in England.

That was not obtained during the remainder of Wil-
 liam’s reign; but early in the next, by 1 Ann. st. 2. c. 8.
 the importation of Irish linen into this country duty free
 was restored, and that has continued to be the law ever
 since.

Is it not therefore probable that Ireland was satisfied
 with this freedom of importing her linen goods, exempt
 from duty, into Great Britain? At least the case certainly
 stands so on the face of the Acts of Parliament; and

^b Journals of the House of Commons, vol. xii. p. 339. 2d July 1698.

besides what I have already mentioned to shew that they are the only sure evidence on such a subject, have we not sufficient reason, from the almost inextricable discussions which the history of what passed in both countries in 1782 has given rise to^b, to avoid recurring for supplementary proof of I know not what implied equitable or understood conditions and stipulations, to anecdotes, harangues, or even entries which may be found on the Journals of either kingdom, but which gave rise to no legislative proceeding?

The Irish act, which was only temporary, expired in 1702, and was not renewed; but a very strong, and certainly harsh act, and not temporary, was passed in England (10th and 11th Will. III. c. 10.) totally prohibiting the exportation of Irish woollens to any foreign country. The power of the English Parliament to make such a law was at that time strenuously insisted upon in this country, and, if not acknowledged, at least acquiesced under in Ireland; so that this last-mentioned statute did in effect prevent the export to all foreign parts, of Irish woollen cloths.

While this continued to be the case, it might have been unjust, and a breach of faith in England or Great Britain, to impose any duty, which might have cramped or injured the exportation of Irish linens, either to this or to foreign countries; but that has been so far from being done, even to this day, that, on the contrary, besides the continuation of the free import, various British acts have given the same bounties to Irish as to British linens exported from hence; and by the imposition of a heavy tax on

^b The ground taken by the opponents of a Union, has rendered those discussions, in regard to the transactions of that period, unavoidable.

foreign linens brought into Great Britain, she gives in that respect also an equal premium to the Irish as to her own manufacture. The bounty paid from the revenue of Great Britain on Irish linens exported has been computed to be, upon an average, upwards of 34,000/.

But does the condition on the part of Ireland still continue? Is her part of the supposed compact still in force; and did she, when Great Britain renounced the claim to bind her by her statutes, renew by any law of her own, the prohibition of the exportation of her woollens? Quite the contrary. Before the boasted æra of her independency, in the year 1779 and 1780, she had wisely, boldly, and successfully addressed to the British Government and Parliament her complaint, that this restriction was injurious to the industry and prosperity of her people; and by the British act of 20 George III. c. 6. the statute of William III. was repealed, and a free exportation of her woollens allowed from Ireland to all foreign places.

It is the natural, obvious, and just observation of a writer on this subject, that ‘ This law, of course, put an end to the compact between England and Ireland, respecting the woollen and linen manufactures^b.’ This country has indeed still continued her encouragement to the Irish linen trade, the free entry into Great Britain, and the bounties on exportation from thence; but she has done so voluntarily, and without any tie, contract, or other obligation, but what the general principles of good policy may impose. One is therefore a good deal surpris’d to read in the address of a gentleman in Ireland, peculiarly distinguished for his knowledge in such matters, to his constituents, the following words:

^b Continuation of Anderson’s Hist. of Commerce, vol. iv. p. 287.

‘ If the linen manufactory rests at all on any compact, that compact was made with the Irish Parliament; the extinction of which takes away a security we have found adequate, and leaves it without the protection of its natural guardians^a.’

According to the same address we are to believe, it seems, that as the compact in 1698 was and is the security for the linen trade of Ireland with Great Britain, so the more solemn and important compact of 1782, not only supplied a new guarantee to that security, by confirming to the former the birthright of a sole^b and independent Parliament, but also, by the same means, roused a *new* spirit of exertion in the traders and manufacturers in general of that kingdom, while a legislative Union would at once destroy the independence of the Parliament, because it would be no lon-

^a Mr. *Foster*’s Address to the Freeholders of the County of Louth, 15th January 1799. The actual existence of such a compact has been more strongly and directly asserted since. ‘ Britain is bound in every instance to encourage our linen trade by compact, so strongly manifest in the proceedings of both Parliaments, as cannot be denied.’ Mr. *Foster*’s ‘ Speech’ p. 83.

^b It appears to me that the word ‘*sole*’ may bear a sense materially different as used in this address, and as it stands in that of the Irish House of Commons in 1782, to which this refers. The words of this address to the electors of Louth are: ‘ The House of Commons stated to his Majesty in 1782, that the very essence of our liberties exists in the right of a *sole Legislature*, the Parliament of Ireland.’ This conveys to me the idea of a legislature which solely has jurisdiction over Ireland. The address of 1782 says, ‘ Ireland is a distinct kingdom with a Parliament of her own, *the sole legislature* thereof.’ This only expresses, as I understand it, that the Irish Parliament alone, without any concurrent right elsewhere, was the legislature of Ireland, without implying that that Parliament cannot be incorporated with that of Great Britain.

ger solely Irish, extinguish the spirit which had been awakened, and remove every safeguard of permanence to whatever advantages it might hold out as a temptation to those weak and deluded persons who might ignorantly form any opinion in its favour.

Much has been said and much written on the subject of that transaction of 1782. It appears to me chiefly of importance, now, in as far as it may afford evidence of what the opinions were which eminent statesmen on both sides of the water then entertained, many of whom must be still anxious to have those opinions rightly understood. But, if their present sentiments correspond with what they formerly thought, this uniformity will be a strong argument in favour of those sentiments, and, in that point of view, it becomes certainly a matter of public concern also, to ascertain what they were. Whatever they were, however, they are not binding upon them; much less upon us, or upon either the Irish or British Parliament. Nay, no act of either Parliament of that time, would be binding on those of the present day; and therefore had each Legislature separately declared that they meant the arrangement, then made, to be such a final adjustment of all relations between the two countries, as that no nearer and more intimate connexion, no legislative Union in a word, should ever be formed between them, that declaration would not be obligatory now, nor stand in the way of the two present Legislatures entering upon, and, if for the benefit of both nations, concluding such a legislative Union. I am unwilling to go far into the controversy on the circumstances of that business. Others, in all respects more competent, have discussed it at large, and it will probably be still farther elucidated this night.

But

But I think I can prove that nothing which appears on the records, or usual reports of the proceedings in Parliament, or on the face of the thing, shows that either party meant, on that occasion, to shut out in future all question of Union, but quite otherwise; that the progressive improvement in the trade, manufactures, and general prosperity of Ireland since, has not been owing to that transaction; that this prosperity is not secured by it; that it depends in a very principal degree on the policy and wisdom of Great Britain; and that the only certain safeguard of its permanence would be found in that very measure, which it is pretended would have the contrary effect.

There were four grievances then stated on the part of Ireland: one and the principal of which was the claim of the British Parliament to a legislative power over that kingdom.

The messages from the Throne to both Parliaments mentioned ‘the King’s concern to find that discontents and jealousies were prevailing *on matters of great weight and importance*; and recommended that *the same* should be taken into consideration, in order to such a *final* adjustment^a as might give mutual satisfaction to both kingdoms^b.’

The addresses of the Irish Houses specified the four grievances, ‘as the principal causes of the present discontent and jealousy’ of that country. The only one of the four

^a Of what, in God’s name? Surely, of those matters of weight and importance, on which jealousies and discontents were then prevailing.

^b 9th April 1782.—16th April 1782.

which a British act could redress, was the claim of legislation.

On the 17th of May a resolution was come to in this House, that the act asserting that claim should be repealed, and immediately afterwards another, declaring it to be ‘in-
 ‘ dispensable to the interests of both kingdoms that the con-
 ‘ nexion between them should be established by mutual con-
 ‘ sent on a solid and permanent basis.’

This last resolution, and the address by which it was communicated to his Majesty, both considered by themselves and in the connexion of this with the other resolution which preceded, have given rise to a great deal of what I must take the liberty to call ingenious cavil and chicanery. The Right Honourable Gentleman who moved the resolutions, now proposed to be carried to the foot of the Throne, in mentioning that address of 1782, had expressed what he had endeavoured to prove to be its true import and meaning, viz.
 ‘ that his Majesty would take *farther* measures to strength-
 ‘ en the connexion between the two countries ;’ on which it has been remarked, with a hypercritical nicety, that the word ‘ farther’ is not in the address.—Neither, I believe, is the word ‘ strengthen.’ But the point is, whether the *meaning* was not, that measures ulterior to those then proposed were in the contemplation of the House when it came to the resolution and voted the address—I say they clearly were. What is the argument triumphantly pressed to shew the contrary? Why, that the *resolution* and *address* were voted *before* the *bill* for repealing the declaratory act of George I. and renouncing the claim to bind Ireland, was presented. Surely, Sir, this is a strange fallacy.

* Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 19.

The Minister of the day, when he moved the two resolutions, is stated to have introduced them by a speech mentioning the four grievances of Ireland, the claim of legislation, Poyning's act, the mutiny bill, and the appellate jurisdiction. The first, he said, was to be redressed here, the others by acts to which the Lord Lieutenant was to be instructed to give the royal assent in Ireland; and *after* having explained this clearly and forcibly, he proceeded to express himself to the following effect:

‘ That Ireland could have no reason to complain; the
 ‘ terms acceded to by England, were proposed by herself;
 ‘ the manner of redress had been prescribed by herself, and
 ‘ all her wishes would now be gratified in the way which she
 ‘ herself liked best: but as it was possible, that if nothing
 ‘ *more was to be done, than what he had stated to be his in-*
 ‘ *tention,* Ireland might perhaps think of fresh grievances,
 ‘ and rise yearly in her demands, *it was fit and proper that*
 ‘ *something should be now done towards establishing on a firm*
 ‘ *and solid basis the future connexion of the two kingdoms.*
 ‘ But that was not to be proposed by him here in Parliament;
 ‘ it would be the duty of the Crown to look to that; the
 ‘ business might be first begun by his Majesty's servants in
 ‘ Ireland; and if afterwards it should be necessary to enter
 ‘ into a treaty, commissioners might be sent from the Bri-
 ‘ tish Parliament, or from the Crown, to enter upon it,
 ‘ and bring the negotiation to a happy issue, by giving mu-
 ‘ tual satisfaction to both countries, and establishing a trea-
 ‘ ty which should be sanctioned by the most solemn forms
 ‘ of the constitutions of both^a.’

^a Mr. Fox's Speech, 17th May 1782, Parliamentary Register, vol. vii. p. 172.

Is it possible, after reading this, which there is no reason to believe to be an inaccurate report as to the substance of what the Right Honourable Gentleman said, that it can be imagined or seriously argued that no ulterior, no *farther* measures were then in his contemplation and in that of the Ministry, whose organ he was, and of which he formed so eminent a part?

This difficulty seems indeed to have been a little felt, and therefore another method is attempted of reconciling to what really then passed, the idea that all political or constitutional arrangements were meant by the parties to this business of 1782 to be finally closed, so as that this country could never, with good faith, agitate in future, or propose to Ireland for her consideration and voluntary adoption or rejection, any thing of that sort. ‘The fact,’ we are told, ‘seems to be, that the resolution, in respect to *future* measures, (where is the mighty difference between *future* and ‘*farther*?’) had *commerce only* in view.’ But, Sir, what does the same Minister say on that point? He is stated to have declared in this House, in 1785, ‘That *no idea of a* ‘*commercial regulation* had been entertained by the administration of 1782, in proposing the resolution in question^d.’

After the Duke of Portland communicated the two resolutions of 1782 to the Irish House of Commons^e, and informed them also of the King’s disposition to give his assent to bills to be passed there for redressing the other grievances,

^c Mr. *Foßer*’s Speech, p. 21.

^d Mr. *Fox*’s Speech, 22d July 1785. Parliamentary Register, vol. xviii. p. 577.

^e 17th May 1782.

they assure his Majesty, in a new address, ‘That, gratified in those particulars, *no constitutional question* between the two nations *will any longer exist*, which can interrupt their harmony^a.’

In the answer to this, the King told them ‘that this declaration was very pleasing to him^b.’

At the close of the session, the Commons say to the Lord Lieutenant, ‘We shall have seen this great national arrangement (the sole and exclusive right of legislation in that Parliament) established on a basis which secures the tranquillity of Ireland, and unites the affections as well as interests of both kingdoms^c.’

Lastly, for I think I have now quoted all the passages on which the chief stress has been laid, his Grace, in his speech on the prorogation, says, ‘Convince the people in your several districts, as you yourselves are convinced, that every cause of *past* jealousies and discontents is *finally* removed; that both countries have pledged their good faith to each other; and that their best security will be an inviolable adherence to that compact: convince them that the two kingdoms are now one, indissolubly connected in unity of constitution and unity of interests^d.’

Now, Mr. Speaker, I must confess I cannot see any thing in all this but the expression of, first, an opinion that the *past* causes of discontent and jealousy were then *finally* removed; and what has happened to prove that they were not? Has the Parliament of Great Britain renewed her claim to bind Ireland? Has there not been an annual mutiny

^a 28th May 1782.

^c 23d July 1782.

^b 13th June 1782.

^d 27th July 1782.

act in Ireland ever since? Has Poyning's law; has the appellate jurisdiction of this country been restored? Secondly, a hope, somewhat too sanguine perhaps, that no question on constitutional points would any longer exist between the two nations. This hope the Irish House of Commons expressed in the form of an assertion, which it would seem his Majesty was no farther advised to adopt than by declaring the pleasure it gave him to find they entertained that belief. But does it follow from thence, that either Parliament meant to preclude themselves from treating together on any measure which the King might recommend, or they think beneficial to both countries? By the phrase 'constitutional questions which might interrupt their harmony,' was clearly meant, disputes and claims on the one part or the other; not proposals from the one to the other, or from the Sovereign to both, which either might approve or reject as they saw fit. Such is the present proposal, which I therefore think they never meant to bind themselves not to entertain; which they could not conclude us, their successors in both kingdoms, from entertaining; which in my conscience I believe many of the wisest and best men in both then hoped might, some time or other, be brought forward with success; which the second resolution I have mentioned, as come to by this House, and received with satisfaction in Ireland, seems in some degree to suggest; and which, when I recollect the reports I have read and heard of the Minister's speech who moved those resolutions, I can never cease thinking his mind was full of on the occasion^a, till I shall learn that he himself has declared the contrary.

^a I do not say he had it expressly in contemplation then or afterwards to propose it. In his speech on the 22d of July 1785, he is reported to have 'spoken of the circumstances of a Union as extremely desirable.' Parliamentary Register, vol. xviii. p. 344.

Is it to be taken for granted, that the improvement beyond example which the trade, manufactures, and wealth of the people of Ireland are said to have experienced during the last sixteen or seventeen years, must be ascribed to the renunciation by this country of the claim to legislate for them? It seems very difficult to see how a mere negative act of that sort could possibly have such an effect. Had the British Legislature, by its usurped authority over that country, for many years previous to that time interfered with the internal or external commerce of Ireland? had the Irish Parliament been restrained from regulating and encouraging that commerce (the export woollen trade excepted) in the way they might think most likely to promote its increase? or did the abolition of the appeal to the British House of Lords produce a new influx of British capital into Ireland?

The great points gained by Ireland from this country as to commerce, have, I believe, hitherto been considered to have been the fruit of those several acts of the British Parliament in 1779 and 1780^b, of which one has been already observed upon, and which first opened to her a general freedom of trade, not only with the rest of the world, but with our American and West India colonies, the best mart for her commodities as well as ours. And if the advantages then obtained have been farther improved by the permission to trade with those colonies in every respect on the same footing as Great Britain does, which was granted in 1793^c; was the British act of that

^b 19 Geo. III. c. 35. 19 Geo. III. c. 37. 20 Geo. III. c. 6. 20 Geo. III. c. 10. 20 Geo. III. c. 18.

^c 33 Geo. III. c. 63.

year giving such permission a consequence of what has been called the emancipation of Ireland?

But, Sir, I think some here must know, and many may recollect to have heard, that Ireland was growing fast in industry, enterprise, manufactures, trade, and agriculture, long before either the acknowledgment of her independence, or the grant of what was called a free trade. Indeed I believe it will be found, whatever may have been the cause, that all the three kingdoms, and his Majesty's dominions in general, have flourished with an *accelerated* degree of rapidity in all the branches of national exertion productive of trade and wealth, for a period of about fifty years, to be dated from the time of the general pacification of Europe by the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle.

With regard to Ireland, besides general memory, I might appeal to the weighty testimony recorded by Mr. *Arthur Young*, of the late Lord Chief Baron *Foster*, in whose family an enlightened attention to political economy and the sources of national prosperity seems to be hereditary. In Mr. *Young*'s account of a visit he paid to that learned person during his tour through Ireland in the year 1776, he says he gave him a variety of information relative to the state of that country uncommonly valuable, and among other things mentions his having told him,
 ' that Ireland was more improved in the last twenty years
 ' than in a century before; that the great spirit began in
 ' 1749 and 1750; that thirty years before the export of
 ' linen

See Young's Tour in Ireland, vol. i. p. 153. Agricultural improvement seems to have been a very principal object of Lord Chief Baron Foster's attention and practice, and the conversations mentioned by Mr. Young related in a great degree to that object; it has been lately stated, however,

‘ linen and yarn was only about 500,000*l.* but that it was then from 1,200,000*l.* to 1,500,000*l.*’^c—that is, it had been nearly trebled in that time. By the same proportion and progress, if only the same causes which then existed, and had produced the great spirit mentioned by Lord Chief Baron *Foster*, had continued to operate, this export would, in six or seven years hence, amount to four millions and a-half. Now, Sir, with all the supposed assistance it has derived from the transaction of 1782, when a fair account is taken, it will not be found to have gone on increasing in that ratio. The annual *rated* value of Irish exports of every sort to all parts of the world, of which provisions made probably more than one third^d, is stated from the official accounts of that country, on an average of the three years ending on the 25th of March 1798, to have been in Irish money only 4,642,779*l.*^e I own therefore I think it much more reasonable that we should ascribe the growing improvement of Ireland in the chief article of her manufacture to the spirit which began in 1750, and appears to have continued in full force during the interval between that time and the date of Mr. *Young’s* tour, than either to a *new* spirit said to have been roused by the arrangement of 1782, an arrangement which

ever, ‘ that the rise of *agriculture* began in Ireland with the constitution of 1782.’—Mr. *Foster’s* Speech, p. 105.

^c *Young’s* Tour, vol. i. p. 151.

^d By Mr. *Irving’s* Tables, out of 5,612,689*l.* the *true* annual value of all the exports from Ireland to Great Britain on the average of the same three years, provisions, exclusive of corn and live cattle, amounted to 1,954,113*l.*—Accounts laid before the House of Lords, No. 4. 16.

^e Vide Appendix to Lord *Auckland’s* Speech, No. 9.

had no direct connexion with such objects, or even to the British acts of 1780, which had.

The next question is, Whether the arrangement of 1782, though it may not have caused, does not secure the permanent continuance of a flourishing commerce to Ireland? After what has been said, this question seems to answer itself; yet we find that transaction alleged to be the foundation of such security, and which it is supposed a Union would entirely take away. Did the acts of the 22d of Geo III. c. 53. and 23d Geo. III. c. 28. while they renounced all power in this Parliament to make laws to bind Ireland, impose any indissoluble restraint on Great Britain, as to the repeal of whatever British statutes might then exist, or might in future be enacted, of a nature beneficial to that country?

We have seen in part the encouragement the Irish linen trade derives from mere British laws; and it might here be a proper time to take a more general and connected view of all the commercial advantages Ireland enjoys, both in that and other respects, solely under those laws; in order to shew how vain, I had almost said how extravagant, the arguments have been, however ably and skilfully conducted, by which it has been attempted to be proved that the balance is *even* between that country and this, or rather preponderates on the side of Ireland. But such general statements have been made already more than once, both here and in the Irish Parliament, and are now to be found in a variety of authentic publications. I will content myself, therefore, with trying to point out some of the fallacies belonging to the endeavours which have been used to shew those statements to be erroneous.

It is admitted that the great market for Irish linen is this country. On the annual average of the four years preceding Lady Day 1798, of about forty millions of yards exported, near thirty-five were sent to Great Britain, and the British colonies and islands; or seven-eighths of the whole^d. This immense quantity was imported duty free, and a great part of what was re-exported received a bounty;^e while all foreign linens imported here were charged with a duty, variously computed, at from above 33 to about 25^f per cent. Taking it at the lowest, is not this a bounty to the amount of no less than one-fourth of the value, on Irish linen goods brought into this kingdom? and is it not a

		<i>Yards.</i>
^d To Great Britain	-	33,695,659
The British colonies	-	1,285,999
		<hr/>
		34,981,658
The States of America	-	4,012,589
All other parts	-	891,533
		<hr/>
Total	-	39,885,780
		<hr/>

This is the account according to the Irish returns. By the Inspector General's books here, the importation into England that year was, as I have stated below (p. 70), 35,338,000.

^e This bounty is confined to linens, whether British or Irish, not under 6*d.* nor exceeding 1*s.* 6*d.* per yard.

^f Foreign linens, in general, are not subject to an *ad valorem* duty, but to a certain rate, per ell or per 100 ells; and almost every species of linen is minutely described in the acts imposing the duty: as, Russia, broad, above 22½ inches wide; Germany, narrow, not exceeding so many inches, &c. But as some sorts might have been omitted in the specific enumeration, there is a sweeping clause, laying 33⅓ per cent. on the value of all linens not particularly described. Scarcely any, however, are in fact imported which are not described. The Inspector General informs me, that on a correct estimate he endeavoured to make about six months ago, of the real price of foreign linens imported, he found the duty on the average of the whole importation, to be about 25 per cent.

difficult

difficult task for any body to undertake to contend, ' that
 ' those linens would (to any considerable extent) find their
 ' way here even though there were no duty on the fo-
 ' reign^d?'

It is indeed stated, and I have no doubt correctly, that Irish linens have risen of late not less than 35 per cent. above their usual value^e. Sir, I have endeavoured to inform myself of the causes of this extraordinary rise, and I believe it will be found to be owing partly to the reduced quantity manufactured on the continent, and at the same time an increased demand in consequence of the war, and partly to unwise and unprofitable speculations occasioned by that circumstance. It seems the demand for shirting for the different armies of Europe has been immense, and considerable quantities of Irish linens have also been lately sent, directly or circuitously, to Spain and Portugal, and likewise to some of our West India islands^f, to be exported from thence to South America, as a substitute for those of German manufacture which used to be sent there, but which are now become too scarce to be sufficient for the supply of that market. In confirmation of this, it appears, on inspecting the British accounts of imports and exports, that during the two years preceding the present, the import of linen from Ireland into this country diminished considerably, while the re-exportation increased. In 1797, the Irish linen imported amounted to 39,868,000 yards, and the re-exportation was but 3,889,830; last year the importation was only 35,338,000 yards, and the re-exportation 6,590,456. From the same sources of information, which I believe I may state to be as authentic, both mercantile

^d Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 89.

^e Ibid.

^f In consequence of permissions granted by the government of this country about a year and a half ago to open a commercial communication between some of those islands and the Spanish continent.

and official, as can be obtained, I learn that foreign linens, particularly those which are used for the same purposes with the Irish, have risen in their price nearly in the same proportion with them; if they have not risen quite so much, this is ascribed to the unthrifty and hazardous speculations I have mentioned.

But let us take it the other way, and suppose the 25 per cent. duty to be extended to the Irish linen. Will it be said, that such a burden on the trade to this country in that article, would not put a stop to it? Will it be so said, by those who have very justly remarked, that a smaller charge of 20 per cent. on its general export, entirely 'put down the woollen trade of Ireland?' If it would not put a stop to it, Ireland is certainly obliged to Great Britain for her generosity or rather profusion, in remitting to her an annual duty it seems she could afford to pay of from half a million to a milling sterling.

In an account produced to the House of Lords by that very able and accurate officer the Inspector General, the true value of all the products and manufactures of Ireland imported into this country, on the average of the three years preceding the 5th of January last, is stated at about five millions and a half^d, while that of the exports of the same sort, from hence to Ireland, amounted to little above two^e; the excess being near three millions and a half^f. On the gross view, therefore, of this sort of debtor and creditor account, Ireland appears to be a gainer to that amount, in consequence of the present commercial code,

^c Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 83.

^d 5,510,825*l*.

^e 2,087,672*l*.

^f 3,425,153*l*.

} Accounts laid before the House of Lords, No. 15.

not of that, but of this country. There are, I believe, considerable differences between the Irish and English official details on these subjects, and any minutely exact computation of the true value cannot be expected. But it will also be admitted, that there is great reliance to be had on the accounts which come from Mr. *Irving's* office; and it is well known that he has taken much pains of late to get at the actual value of all the exports and imports of Great Britain. I am therefore inclined to think that the above may be taken, for the purposes of the present argument, as sufficiently correct.

By a similar account of the same officer, also presented to the Lords, the true value of the total imports from Ireland into this country, was, on the like average, 5,612,689 *l.*; that of the exports from hence thither, 3,555,845 *l.*; leaving, on this comparison, not so great an excess indeed, but still an apparent balance of 2,056,844 *l.* in favour of Ireland^d.

But we are told^e, that upon a proper examination of the articles which compose the gross sums in these accounts, the real balance will be found to be much in favour of Great Britain.

To make this out, the objects of the mutual trade of the two kingdoms are classed under the three heads of, 1. manufactures; 2. raw materials, &c.; and, 3. foreign articles. The particulars are then arranged in such a manner as to make it appear, 1st, that Ireland takes from Great Britain to the amount of 14,000 *l.* a

^d Accounts laid before the House of Lords, No. 16.

^e Mr. *Foster's* Speech, p. 80.

year more, under the first head, than Great Britain does from her: 2d, that she supplies Britain with an excess of raw materials, including articles of prime necessity, to the amount of no less than 2,463,447*l.*: and, 3d, that the excess of the foreign articles exported from this country into Ireland, over the similar imports from thence into this country, is 1,366,309*l.*

This is a very different method of stating the case from what has been usual, at least as far as I have been able to inform myself. I certainly feel how unequal I am to enter the lists on points of this sort with the Gentleman who has thus stated it on the present occasion; but I have endeavoured, with the assistance of those who are more accustomed to such matters than I pretend to be, to ascertain whether the right clue might not be found to this seeming refutation of the hitherto received opinion, that the profitable balance is very greatly in favour of Ireland. I think it may, and I will attempt to explain myself in regard to it, in the best manner I can.

1. To the amount of British manufactures taken off by Ireland, which, by Mr. *Irving's* tables, is but 1,640,195*l.* have been added all the articles brought either from our American colonies or the East Indies, the value of which is not less than 970,000*l.*^d

‘ Much of this,’ we are told, ‘ is real manufacture^e, and
‘ that the rest may be deemed so, on account of the employ
‘ of labour in the colony, and of the shipping^f.’

^d Mr. *Foster's* Speech, p. 80.

^e Scarcely any part of the goods brought from the West Indies and America can be considered as such.

^f Mr. *Foster's* Speech, *ibid.*

But surely it can never be intended seriously to maintain, that Great Britain profits as much by the industry, skill, and labour employed by the people of the East and West Indies in manufacturing for the use of these kingdoms their own raw materials, as Ireland does by those of her inhabitants engaged in her domestic fabrics. Indeed, as to the British West Indian and American colonies, it seems to me that since a full participation in the trade with them has been opened to Ireland, the opulence acquired by manufactures or otherwise in those parts of the British dominions, in as far as it is not to be considered as merely local, merely West Indian or American, is to be reckoned not British more than Irish, but imperial; and this is also true as to the East Indies, supposing the Irish act of 1793^d to have secured to Ireland as great a share of commercial intercourse with that country as she had in any way the means of carrying on; a supposition more than warranted by the little or rather I believe no use she has made of the privileges since she obtained it.

With regard to the shipping, undoubtedly Great Britain is a gainer by carrying the East and West India articles required for the consumption of Ireland. But could Ireland, all circumstances considered, obtain those articles so beneficially in any other way? Her own tonnage is not equal to the carriage of her own produce and manufactures to this country; and in the present state of things, even the rest of Europe is almost entirely supplied by Great Britain, notwithstanding the protection the naval commerce of several other states derives from their neutrality. When to these considerations we add the immense variety of channels of a more advantageous nature, in a mercantile view, in which

^d Irish acts, 33 Geo. III. c. 31.

it is well known that the British capital vested in this branch of her carrying trade might be employed, we shall not easily be persuaded to place whatever gain arises from it to the credit side of Ireland, in settling accounts between that country and this.

2. Under the general head of raw materials, &c. exported from Ireland, have been included, by the description of articles of prime necessity, beef, butter, pork, corn, and other provisions; Irish linen yarn is also classed under this head; while cheese, fish, such as cod and herrings, &c. and raw silk and cotton yarn, are articles classed as manufactures among the British exports.

But in comparisons of this sort, the expression of 'raw materials' has been generally used to signify matters which constitute the basis of a manufacture, and contribute thereby much more to the wealth of the country to which they are carried, and where they are worked up, than in their rude state they had done to that of the country supplying them. In this sense beef, corn, &c. cannot with any propriety be ranked under that description; they add nothing to the wealth of the country importing them; they continue just worth the price at first paid for them^a, and in the case under our consideration, if not obtained from Ireland, the same capital would probably procure them elsewhere, or might be directed to the production of them at home.

3. Although the sum of 970,000*l.* by the title of colonial goods, had been added under the first of these three heads

^a We are not here to reckon the mere mercantile profit they may afford in their unaltered state; the price paid for them would have furnished a like profit employed in any other way, and will, having been so employed, furnish a like profit to the seller.

to the amount of British manufactures exported to Ireland, it is here retained to make up the gross sum of 1,468,173*l.* as the value of foreign articles taken by Ireland from Great Britain, and is thus twice charged against this country: this has clearly happened by mistake, though it makes a most material difference indeed in the result.

But it is said ‘ the excess of gain to Great Britain must appear prodigious, if we consider that of all that gross sum of near a million and a half, only 407,000*l.* is East India trade; and that what remains, to the value of above a million, is open to be imported direct to Ireland, were she obliged or *inclined* to import it so^d.’ Undoubtedly it is open to her; but if she could do it to advantage, will any man who knows the nature of trade suppose that she would not have the *inclination*, but would suffer Great Britain to gain from her what she does by thus acting as her carrier? The truth is, she wants shipping and capital, what she has being necessarily occupied to better advantage, or for more necessary purposes; and such being the case, can we in fairness be required to set this down as a benefit which Great Britain holds at the good-will of her sister kingdom?

Thus, Sir, I think we must still retain the belief hitherto so prevalent with the generality of those in both countries, who have most deeply considered such matters, that in their commercial intercourse the balance between them is greatly in favour of Ireland; and it follows of course, that Ireland, in the present relative situation of the two kingdoms, must depend entirely on the policy and wisdom of the British Parliament for the continuance of what-

^d Mr. Foster’s Speech, p. 81.

ever part of her general prosperity she derives from that source.

This indeed is sometimes^d admitted : it is admitted that Great Britain, by what is called a war of duties and prohibitions, might injure Ireland for a time ; of this America, it is said, affords ample proof ; but that Britain herself must suffer in such a contest, and that her wisdom, her liberality, and her own interest will forbid her entering into such hostilities. I entirely agree in the position that it is not only liberal, but wise, and for her own advantage, that the present system should be persevered in by this country, though I regret that America should have been unnecessarily mentioned, and this at the very time, and as it were with the same breath with which the Right Hon. Gentleman who has proposed a Union, was in my opinion most unjustly accused of holding out *threats* to induce Ireland to accede to it. Alas ! Sir, have we then no instances where the wisest nations have departed from the line of sound policy, and by the operation of various causes on the natural frailty of human counsels and conduct, adopted measures at once injurious to themselves and their neighbours ; or is wisdom of conduct to be the possession in perpetuity—the exclusive right—of all the successive Administrations and Parliaments which, in all times to come, are to hold the reins of government, and exercise the functions of legislation in Great Britain ? Should the principles which now prevail on commercial subjects lose their influence ; should disputes, passion, and animosity, ever take their place in adjusting the relations of trade between the two islands ; to what binding laws, to what inviolable treaty can Ireland

^d Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 90, 91.

appeal? or what will then avail towards compelling the admission of her commodities into the British ports and markets, or the exportation of what she may want from thence, her own Parliament, the supposed adequate guardian of her trade, its vigilance, its regulations, and its bounties? Will the independence and distinctness of that Parliament be able to ward off the blow, which on such a supposition may be aimed at her prosperity, when she shall have shut her ears to that warning voice which now calls upon her to listen to the salutary measure by which alone she can be really and completely secured against the possibility of such an evil?

We are, it is true, too apt to think, when we think superficially, that our descendants will never relapse into errors similar to those of our forefathers, from which we have escaped; and that what appears right and wise to us, must be thought so by them. But does experience confirm this opinion? Those who have attended to the great and numerous fluctuations of system in our national policy foreign and domestic, will, I believe, decide otherwise.

We think our fathers fools, so wise we grow :
Our wiser sons, no doubt, will think us so—

is the sensible, though perhaps not very poetical reflection of a great and sagacious poet. Have we not heard the obsolete notion of making Ireland a British garrison, revived in this House, and from a most respectable quarter? On the present occasion it was indeed, I think, a single, and, if the Hon. Gentleman will pardon the expression, a singular opinion; but a change of times and circumstances may perhaps render it less so. I dread to reflect on the possibility
of

of its ever becoming reasonable ; those, however, who will have to determine, may think it so, when the sentiments of none of us can have any share in the deliberation.

What was the case of Scotland ? every body must now admit that, being under the same king, who was also head of both Parliaments, and with the rules of succession to the crown (till the Revolution) the same in both kingdoms, it would have been the interest of England to have encouraged the trade of Scotland, and conferred upon her every favour that could have tended to increase her prosperity. But how different was the conduct she actually held to her ? Was the Parliament of Scotland less independent than the Irish Parliament has been since 1782 ? and does it not appear from history that Scotland was to the full as desirous, had she had the means of establishing a national commerce, and rivalling in her proportion the trade and manufactures of the neighbouring kingdom, as Ireland can now possibly be to retain and augment those which she at present possesses ?

In 1785, those persons in Ireland who in my opinion had the best knowledge of her interests, did not think the advantages she then enjoyed from her commercial connexion with Great Britain, were sufficiently safe under the shield of British acts and British policy ; ‘ they wished to have ‘ the security of a legislative compact,’ and this country was desirous to give them that security, in as binding and permanent a form as was compatible with the existence of distinct Legislatures. The mistaken jealousy of speculative independence defeated the plan. It is now proposed to give

^a Mr. Foster’s Speech, p. 87.

them a legislative security of a much more binding nature, one as indissoluble as human wisdom can devise or imagine; but we are now told by some of the strongest advocates for the much more imperfect measure of that year, even in respect to commerce, that a compact by Union, to dissolve which no legitimate authority would any longer exist in either country, would be a measure pregnant with danger and mischief to Irish trade and manufactures^d. Sir, with what success the consistency of these sentiments has been contended for, I shall leave to others to determine; it is now, it seems, thought safest solely to trust to ‘ a connexion riveted on the interests, the sentiments, and the affections of both nations, and those rivets closed and kept firm by the regulations of 1782^e.’

Some admit that there are commercial benefits still left for Great Britain to bestow; that a perfectly free communication between the two islands, a complete interchange of commodities of all sorts, without the charge of any kind of duty in their transit from the one to the other, would greatly redound to the advantage of Ireland; that she would then send more manufactured goods to Great Britain than she yet does, and receive a greater quantity and variety of raw materials from thence. But then it is asked, why should not this country complete her system of liberality to the sister kingdom? That is in one moment called liberality, which in another is described as mere selfishness, or an unwilling ransom extorted by intimidation. Why should she not grant to Ireland, without the condition of a Union, what by benefiting her must also benefit herself?

^d Mr. *Foster*'s Speech, p. 91.

^e *Ibid*, p. 109. Vide also p. 48. 51. 55. 63.

Others however tell us, that if the British minister were to ask them what farther trade could be opened? what new manufactures promoted? their answer would be, 'You can give us nothing, and our only request on the part of Ireland is, that you will let us alone^a.'

Both these grounds are taken by different persons in arguments against a Union, and for the purpose of proving that Ireland either ought to obtain, or, if she has already obtained, ought for ever to be permitted to possess every possible benefit of trade she can derive from this kingdom, without our proposing that she should agree to that measure; that is, agree to a settlement which, while it would afford the only permanent security for those benefits, would, in my opinion, at the same time confer others of a still more important nature than any commercial advantage whatever, both on that country and on this.

With that opinion, I do not scruple to say, in regard to such commercial boons as may still be left in the power of Great Britain, that I would not be hasty to part with them if there were any chance that a belief that they can only be acquired through a Union might work in its favour on the selfish tempers of those who overlook the many more weighty political reasons for its adoption.

As to the advantages which have already been granted, though it may be true that, in contributing to the prosperity of Ireland, they also promote that of the whole empire, of which she forms so material a part; what if the machinations of foreign and domestic enemies,—the suggestions of ill-directed national vanity,—the exaggerated

^aMr. Foster's Speech, p. 77.

and mistaken principle of independence,—and the restless and proselytical spirit of democracy, should succeed in tearing asunder this mighty limb from the imperial body ; would it, in such case, be still for the interest of Great Britain to continue the laws by which those advantages have been bestowed ?

Sir, I do not like to pursue this train of reflection ; but I am satisfied, for many reasons which I think must occur to all who hear me, and of which some have been lately stated in another place with irresistible strength and perspicuity of argument, that those causes are at this moment operating, some of them open and avowed, others more silent, and scarcely perceptible to the very persons actuated by them, but all with such increasing energy, that if a Union does not soon take place, a separation unfortunate to Great Britain and ruinous to Ireland certainly will.

I have already mentioned my persuasion, that the people of Ireland will in time, after a really final settlement of the connexion and relations between the two countries by an incorporating Union, experience the advantages of a communication of English capital and credit. This position, when stated by much more weighty authority, has been treated, I find, as ‘ a foolish, absurd, futile, and unsupported assertion.’ How this selection of epithets should have been so made and applied by a person of known judgment, good temper, and urbanity, it is not my business to inquire ; but I think the assertion, which by the by, as it related to what may be expected to happen, was an assertion only of opinion and belief, may be considered as ap-

* *Mr. Foster's Speech*, p. 68. 76.

proaching as nearly to a prediction of the truth as any thing can do, which mere human foresight may conjecture and pronounce concerning future consequences and events. Is much argument necessary to convince us that monied men will be more ready than at present to lend their capital on landed security, or to pledge their credit by partnerships in trade and manufactures in that country, after it shall possess a steady uniformity of government,—the same legislature with themselves,—an established conformity of legal decisions to those whereby their property is regulated and secured at home,—internal peace and habitual industry?

But a detail is gone into to shew that English money is not likely to be transported to Ireland and vested there, either in trade or manufactures.

If I understand the general scope of that detail, and if I do not, it must be owing to the little familiarity I have with such subjects, it is this: 1st, A Union will not carry over English capital to be employed in the manufactory in Ireland of any of the great articles of consumption with which we now supply that country, viz. woollens, cotton, goods, iron, and pottery, because England has advantages for those fabrics not to be found in Ireland, which will always render them so much cheaper in the former country, that the Irish consumer will rather import them from thence, than buy them as made at home. 2d, Neither will a Union induce the English capitalist to establish such manufactures in Ireland for exportation to foreign markets, because those foreign markets have been long as open to Ireland as they can be after a Union, and yet no such establishments have taken place. 3d, As it will not carry over English capital

to establish, either for Irish consumption or foreign export, those manufactures in which Britain excels Ireland; neither will it attract it to that manufacture in which Ireland undersells Great Britain, namely, the linen; ‘for though that
 ‘manufactory has been free and prosperous in Ireland for
 ‘these ninety years, and has afforded many great fortunes
 ‘to the industrious who have engaged in it, yet hardly
 ‘any British capital has settled in it^a.’

Permit me, Sir, to examine shortly how these different points are made out.

‘Iron and pottery,’ it is said, ‘depend so totally on plenty and cheapness of fuel, that they exist only in the coal countries, and have never known, even in England, to make what can be called a settlement at any distance from a plentiful colliery. In the pottery too, the flint and clay which are so abundant in England, have not been found in any quantity in Ireland, and in fact there is not a single pottery in Ireland. It is self-evident, therefore, that these manufactures never can travel from the country which has coal, to that which has it not—from Britain to Ireland;—and the same facility of fuel must give to Britain a decided preference in all manufactures where steam engines cheapen the price of labour. Woollens, though established for centuries in Yorkshire, have never travelled in any direction ten miles from the coal country, and they are manufactured there to such advantage over Ireland, that England supplies her to the value of near 600,000*l.* a year, though burdened with an import duty

^a Mr. Foster’s Speech, p. 75.

‘ of more than 8 per cent. And as to cottons, machinery
 ‘ being more used in this manufactory than in the others,
 ‘ the Irish cannot, even on the eastern coast opposite the
 ‘ British collieries, make cotton twist within at least 20 per
 ‘ cent. as cheap as Britain can supply them. In Britain,
 ‘ during the continuance of *Arkwright’s* patent, this fabric
 ‘ was subject to a heavy charge on that account ; but though
 ‘ such exclusive privilege did not exist in Ireland, no En-
 ‘ glish money was ever employed to fit up his machinery
 ‘ there^a’.

You will perceive how much stress is laid in this enumeration of difficulties on the circumstance of fuel. But let us not take it for granted, either that cheapness of fuel is so indispensable a requisite to cheapness of manufacture, even in the instances in question, as that it may not be compensated for by other circumstances ; or that abundance of coal is a benefit which nature has so absolutely denied to Ireland as seems in this part of the argument to have been assumed.

Take the case of iron: I am informed that some of the articles made of that metal which require the greatest consumption of coals, for example anchors, are manufactured in this metropolis, where fuel is, I believe, dearer than in almost any other part of the kingdom. Labour is also dearer here than in most of the other sea-port towns, to which those anchors are to be sent. Yet other circumstances having occasioned the employment of the capital, and the cultivation of the skill necessary for that business in this place, it seems that it can be carried on, on the whole, to more advantage here than where both coals and labour are much

^a Mr. *Foster’s* Speech, p. 68, 69, 70, 72, 73,

cheaper.

cheaper. The importance of the cheapness of fuel to the manufacturing of other commodities made of iron, is much over-rated; it is certainly a very material circumstance in regard to coarser articles; but it will be found, by consulting the proper documents, that four-fifths of the goods made of iron, which are annually exported from Great Britain to Ireland and other parts of the world, consist of goods in the manufacture of which the price of coals has hardly any perceptible effect: the principal value of those goods is derived from the skill and labour of the artisan; but labour is also dearer in the places where they are made, chiefly Birmingham and Sheffield, than in most parts of the world. The only advantage therefore Great Britain possesses as to such articles arises from the superior skill, expertness, and celerity of the workman. But with the encouragement which a new state of things would hold out to the Irish manufacturers, is it to be doubted that they will attain to an equality in those respects with those of this country*?

The statement as to the woollen goods made in Great Britain, would lead an inattentive person to suppose that this manufacture was almost entirely confined to York-

^a I am informed that the city of Liege affords a striking example of the small relative importance of cheapness of fuel and labour, to the success of the most valuable manufactures in iron. That city had been for many ages noted for those manufactures; coals may be dug almost at the very gates of the town, and at a very trifling expense, as the veins are to be found within a few feet of the surface, and there is hardly any part of the continent where provisions are cheaper and more abundant; yet Birmingham and Sheffield now undersell Liege in those very manufactures for which she had been long so famous, with the exception of a very few articles, at the rate of not less than from 15 to 25 per cent.

shire. That county, or rather a circuit within that county of not more than ten miles every way, is called its 'old and great settlement*.' But the fact is, that the trade there, though certainly very extensive, is confined chiefly to the coarser kind of cloths, while the principal seat of the manufactory of fine cloths, as well as of the light and fancy woollen goods, is in a part of England where coals are much dearer than in a great many parts of Ireland, namely, at Bradford, Trowbridge, and Chippenham.

The real case as to the Irish woollen trade, is, that Ireland works up all the wool she produces, though she now only exports to the value of about 12,500*l.* yearly, instead of 110,207*l.* her export of that article a century ago, and she receives from this country to the annual amount of 580,723*l.* This is no longer owing to the restrictive condition of a compact long ago at an end; nor does it appear that the goods of this material which she does make, are dearer or necessarily so than those she imports from hence, the quality of each being considered;—we are told the true reason; it is, 'that agriculture and the linen manufactures are found to give better profit in land than sheep afforded†;' a reason which, no doubt, as to that manufacture will continue to operate, whatever may become of the present duties upon it in its transit either from Ireland to this country, or from hence to Ireland.

In the cotton business I understand the consumption of coals is, comparatively speaking, very inconsiderable. Fuel is not more abundant now in England than it was five-and-

* Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 69.

† Ibid. p. 72.

twenty years ago; yet during that period the quantity of cotton wool manufactured in Great Britain has increased from three to near thirty millions of pounds. The importation of the raw material is alike open to Ireland; that country abounds in weavers; and I am told the workman who is in the practice of weaving linen is capable, with little or no previous instruction or practice, of becoming an expert weaver of plain cottons. What then is the real cause of her paying to this country more than 100,000*l.* a year for cotton goods manufactured here? what but the want of that capital which alone excites the industry and attention, and thereby improves the skill of the workman, furnishes the means of dividing labour, which diminishes its cost beyond any difference, a difference in the amount of wages and expense of living can ever occasion, and enables the opulent trader to give long credit, support accidental losses, and thrive under a much smaller profit than is requisite to others less fortunate in that respect, who might attempt to become his rivals.

But, does Great Britain possess such advantages over Ireland in respect of fuel as has been supposed?

Many coal-mines exist and are worked in Ireland^c, and I believe in many parts of it the veins are rich and extensive. Mr. *Evans*, engineer to the Grand Canal, in his evidence laid before the Irish House of Commons in 1783, as quoted two years afterwards at the bar of this House, said, ‘ That the Kilkenny collieries, if properly worked, were capable of producing 300, 000 tons of culm yearly : that this might be carried by the canal

^a Mr. *Foster’s* Speech, p. 88, Beaufort’s Memoir, p. 27.

and sold at the distance of forty miles for 1s. 6d. per barrel of 4 cwt.; that there were collieries at Lough Allen equal in quantity, if properly worked, to the supply of the whole kingdom, and in quality equal, if not superior, to the best Whitehaven coals^c. There are seams of coal at Drumglafs and Dungannon^d, said to be of such thickness and goodness as to be more than equal to six times the consumption of Dublin; and those collieries are within a few miles of a canal by which a water communication is already open to that city and every other part of Ireland. What has been the real cause that those mines have not hitherto been turned to account? Not the want of encouragement from the Irish Parliament; they have been always ready and liberal in furnishing public aid to works promising to prove of public benefit. But experience has long shewn that public money, even to profusion, will not perform the functions of private capital, the utter deficiency of which appears to have occasioned the failure of every undertaking hitherto formed for completing the works necessary to furnish the metropolis and country of Ireland with this valuable commodity from her own mines.

After all, while coals brought coastwise from one part of England to another, exclusive of London, are subject to a duty of somewhat more than 5s. 9d. per chaldron, and if to London, of no less than 9s 5d., when exported to Ireland they pay but 1s. 9d. in Great Britain, and, if for the use of the manufactories, no Irish duty; and an inexhaustible supply from Wales, Whitehaven, and the west of Scotland, is open to the whole extent of the

^c Minutes of Evidence, 2d May 1783.

^d Young's Tour, vol. ii. p. 91.

eastern shores of Ireland; and from the shortness of the run and other circumstances, besides the inferiority of duty, the expense of freight and other charges is really considerably less between those parts of Great Britain and Ireland, than to the places in England where the manufacturer is obliged to have his fuel by water-carriage.

In regard to the flint and clay used in the pottery wares, if faith is to be given to the testimony of a person who knew that business very thoroughly, it will appear that England is far from possessing such great natural advantages over Ireland as has been supposed. The late Mr. *Wedgwood*, on his examination before this and the other House of Parliament when the Irish Propositions were depending, stated, that some of the flints used in this manufacture are brought from the Irish shore, being picked up from the ballast of Irish vessels discharged at Liverpool; and that the finer clay is procured on the coast of England, and can be shipped at 6 or 7*s.* per ton, but that from the additional charge of the inland carriage, it costs when it reaches Staffordshire from 1*l.* 16*s.* to 2*l.* 2*s.* His conclusion was, that if the propositions had been adopted, Ireland might have underfold Great Britain in pottery goods 40 or 50 per cent.^d

To shew that British capital will not, in consequence of a legislative Union, be vested, or British credit pledged, either in the establishment of new Irish manufactures for foreign markets, or in the farther cultivation and extension of the existing linen trade of that country, the reasoning

^d Minutes of Evidence, &c. at the bar of the House of Commons, 2d May 1785, p. 177, 178. At the bar of the House of Lords, 16th June 1785, p. 145, 152, 160, 161.

drawn from the experience of what has happened while there was no such Union, proceeds on a direct *petitio principii*, on the assumption that such Union will neither furnish invitations which cannot be expected, nor remove obstacles which cannot be done away, by any other means. Indeed the great staple commodity of Ireland, her linen, is even now much more indebted to British credit than from the statements I have referred to would be supposed. It may be true that, in a strict sense, British capital has not ‘*settled*’ (to any extent) in Ireland, that is, that persons from this kingdom have not removed with large capitals to reside in that country for the purpose of carrying on a traffic in Irish linens. But is it a correct inference from thence, that British money has had no influence in promoting the fabric of those linens? I have the very best reason to believe that in general the linen manufacturers and merchants in Ireland, in order to be able to carry on their business, find it necessary to draw on the agent or factor here to whom their consignments are made, immediately after the goods are shipped, for about two-thirds of the amount of their value, although a very considerable part of those goods often remains on the hands of such consignee for six or nine months, and he is afterwards frequently obliged to continue still longer out of his money by the credit he is expected to give to the purchasers.

Sir, the security and advancement of trade and manufactures are unquestionably matters of great national concern, but I can never look upon them as the chief, much less as the exclusive objects of Government. I am satisfied Ireland would gain by an Union with Great

Britain advantages much more important^d; general civilization; settled habits of morality and true religion, in the room of the blind superstition and fanatical rage, now too commonly to be found among the different sects in that country; a uniform submission to law; and that which is essential to the attainment of those great ends, the mitigation and gradual extinction of the spirit of disturbance, insurrection, devastation, plunder and massacre, which has prevailed among the Irish peasantry with more or less violence, but almost without intermission, as far back as we can trace their authentic history, though under various pretexts, and with various distinctions and appellations, serving at different periods as the watch-words for every species of bloody and barbarous hostility. It would be a useless, tedious, and disgusting task to enter into the particulars of this sort, with which the annals of Ireland are filled, especially since the period when the unfortunate adherence of the majority of the people to the errors of the Romish church established the great division of her inhabitants into Protestants and Papists.

I own I have been often astonished to find men of sense and information imputing this melancholy condition of society in Ireland, to this or the other measure or system of this or the other ministry of the present reign; a reign too, which has been distinguished by a continued series of acts of lenity and beneficence to that country. But I was particularly surprised, upon a late occasion, to hear all the miseries and discord we have lately witnessed, all the bloodshed which has deluged our sister kingdom, charged to the recall of a respectable and

^d *Smith's Wealth of Nations*, vol. iii. p. 460.

amiable Nobleman from the Lord Lieutenancy in the spring of 1795. Is it then believed that all would have been well if Lord *Fitzwilliam* had been left to govern Ireland, on the principles which he had been advised, or was resolved to adopt? Is it thought that the disciples of *Tone*, whose political gospel was framed and promulgated years before the appointment of that Chief Governor, would have been satisfied with his intended grant of Catholic emancipation, and his intended refusal of Parliamentary reform? Sir, we have demonstrative proof that the concession of both would not have satisfied them. That preacher of revolution and his disciples were to be satisfied with nothing that his Majesty's Government, or his Parliament, could give; they were to be satisfied only by the establishment of a Democratic Republic with a Gallo-Hibernian Directory; while the imaginations of their mad and deluded followers were inflamed—not with considerations of religion or legislature—of this or that set of dogmas—or this or that form and right of election—but with a rage for the invasion of property; the abolition of tithes and even rent, on the true French plan, without compensation or equivalent; the extinction of all law, civil and criminal!

Others admit that the misfortunes of Ireland are not solely imputable to the recall of Lord *Camden's* predecessor, or to what I believe they modestly and charitably denominate the weak and wicked policy of his Majesty's present Ministers. They are willing to allow that former administrations, for a long course of years, are entitled to their share in the blame. In truth, Sir, if the servants of the Crown, at different periods, were answerable for those inveterate and ever recurring disorders of that country which prevailed during their respective administrations,

administrations, not one could be exculpated of all those who have at any time had a share in the government of the empire, from the days of *Burleigh*, *Bacon*, and *Walsingham*, down to the days of their present successors in the responsible departments of the state; neither Lord *Strafford*, a name not free perhaps from just reproach, but illustrious also for talents and virtues to which his descendant the noble earl I have mentioned must look back with satisfaction and pride, nor Lord *Clarendon*, the Dukes of *Ormond*, Lord *Somers*, Lord *Cowper*, Sir *Robert Walpole*, Mr. *Pelham*, &c. &c. any more than those whom we ourselves have known at different times entrusted by his present Majesty with the conduct of public affairs. But do gentlemen seriously believe that all the successive measures of so many great, enlightened, and liberal statesmen were inspired by blind ignorance, tyrannical oppression, or infatuated folly? Sir, I cannot agree in such a lampoon, both on the memory of so many great men whom I have learned to reverence and admire, and on the general principles and practice of the English government for more than two centuries. I believe every thing which wise and impartial policy could suggest has, at different times, been tried, and alas! tried in vain, during that long period; though it cannot be denied that occasions have also intervened, where passion, prejudice, and short-sighted maxims of government have prevailed. But on the whole, the unavoidable conclusion is this—to adopt the words of one of the learned barristers to whom I referred in an early part of what I have submitted to the House, as I have seen them reported—‘ There is some radical error in the *system* of Irish government, and this should be sought for and corrected, else the seeds of discontent will fructify for ever.’ The gentleman indeed

indeed seems to have meant a radical error, not in the *frame and constitution*, but in the *administration* of the Irish Government. That opinion I have, I think, clearly refuted. To what remaining source then are we to trace this fundamental defect, whose existence is so manifest? To what other can it be traced, but to the imperfections incident to a local and distinct Parliament, in a country forming but part, and the least powerful part, of an extensive empire; to that Parliament which, though often, and now I believe particularly, containing in it men of as great talents and integrity as can exist any where, has yet, after the experience of ages, been found inadequate to provide an effectual remedy for the hitherto incurable maladies of the country?

Permit me, Sir, here to advert to certain arguments I have lately met with, to prove that it cannot be expected that an incorporated Legislature, assembled at Westminster, should be able to tranquillize Ireland, or gradually establish civilization and a peaceable submission to the authority of the laws among the lower orders of its inhabitants. Such a Parliament will be unacquainted, it seems, with the local circumstances of a kingdom ‘ which it ‘ never sees,’ and will be at too great a distance to administer in time to the wants or wishes of the people, or to guard against excesses or discontents^d. One might suppose, from this statement, that the Irish Parliament is in a continual progress through the island, or ready to fly at a moment from one end of it to the other, whenever wishes are to be gratified, or discontents suppressed. Does the British Legislature, in its aggregate state, ever see more

^d Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 65.

of Great Britain than is contained within the walls of this or the other House of Parliament? or is it not the province of the Executive Ministers of Government, not of the Legislature, on sudden emergencies, to dispense instant favours or apply instant coercion, if the good of the community shall require the one sort of interposition or the other? subject, no doubt, to the censure of the Legislature, if they shall unnecessarily on such occasions transgress, but entitled to indemnity if they shall appear to have acted wisely in exceeding, the bounds of their lawful authority.

Since, as has been truly said, ‘ neither peace nor war ‘ necessarily require the act of either Legislature,’ and the supreme Executive Government in London is, by the constitution of the empire, entrusted with the care of repelling any sudden and unexpected invasion even of Ireland, by a *foreign* enemy, one would imagine the branches of that Executive Government which will continue resident in Dublin, might be supposed adequate to whatever immediate measures any emergency alike sudden and unexpected may call for, towards the suppression of riots, insurrection, or rebellion *in* that country.

I am most willing and ready to allow an extraordinary merit to the energy of the Irish Parliament during the late fatal rebellion, which the concurrent exertions of both Legislatures, of the Executive Government in both countries, and, above all, of the brave troops of Ireland and Great Britain, under the benign providence of God, have so fortunately repressed, though, I fear, not totally extinguished; but I should think it an ill compli-

ment to the Irish Parliament and the Irish nation, were I to suppose that the distinguished share they have had in the happy change which has been effected, could be in any great degree ascribed to the impresson made by a procession of two hundred Members of that Parliament, with the mace at their head, through the streets of Dublin, from College Green to the Castle^a.

It seems this idea of a resident Legislature is to be carried so far as to warrant the supposition, that if Scotland had had its Parliament sitting at Edinburgh, the conspiracy which has been traced to that country, would have been sooner developed, and more completely crushed^b. Is it then recommended that the Scotch Union should be dissolved? Or is the Parliament in London only competent to preserve tranquillity on the south side of the Tweed?

It is asked, if a resident Parliament and resident gentry cannot soften the manners, amend the habits, or promote social intercourse, will *no* Parliament and fewer resident gentry do it^c. I answer this by another question, Has what is called a resident Parliament done it? It has not, it is not pretended that it has. And as to the United Legislature being no Parliament for Ireland, I have endeavoured, and I trust with success, to shew, in a former part of what I have said, how extremely ill-founded that proposition is. With regard to the residence of the Irish gentry, I shall submit a few observations by and by. None, in my opinion, are requisite in answer to the remarks concerning the plots which have existed in this kingdom, and the pertinacious adherence of the Welsh to their national language, and of the Highlanders to theirs

^a Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 66.

^b Ibid.

^c Ibid. p. 64.

and their ancient dress^a. For who can be persuaded as to those circumstances (the first most serious indeed, but of a temporary nature, and arising from accidental causes; the others such as are not to be changed, if such a change is really important, but by the gradual and slow operation of increasing intercourse) that there is any sort of comparison between them and the rooted evils of habitual resistance to all law, and insurrection against all legitimate authority, so prevalent in Ireland?

It has been said, Will a legislative Union appease Catholic discontent, or assuage the animosity of the Protestants? I answer, I am satisfied the *separate* Parliament of Ireland never will, perhaps with safety it never can, admit the Catholics to participate in the higher political privileges of the state; and the Catholics will never quietly submit to an *Irish* Parliament exclusively Protestant, having learned to consider that exclusive jurisdiction as an oppressive tyrannical usurpation of the few upon the many. Perhaps a *United* Parliament may find it safe to admit them; and if their admission were safe, their exclusion would thenceforward be unjust. I will not now enter into the argument of that grave and momentous question. I have often and long reflected upon it; and, if the occasion shall ever require it, I shall be ready freely to deliver my sentiments in regard to it. I do not think the present occasion calls for its discussion. I will only observe, that it seems to be the opinion as well of some of those who understand the interests of the Protestant establishment and are most peculiarly bound in duty to guard and maintain them, as of some who have come forward in public the earnest and zealous opposers of the Catholic claims should the present local

^a Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 67.

Parliament remain—of the venerable Primate of Ireland, as declared in his speech on the 22d of January last, and of Dr. *Duigenan*, as stated in his celebrated answer to Mr. *Grattan*—that Catholic emancipation, as it is affectedly called, might, in case of the legislative incorporation of Ireland with this country, be acceded to without danger. The words of Dr. *Duigenan* are remarkable. They struck me much on the first appearance of his work, before this measure of Union had been so generally thought of as it has been since; and I then pointed them out to the attention of many of my friends. I believe they have already been referred to in some former debates; but as the passage is short, I will take the liberty of reading it.

‘ If we were one people with the British nation, the preponderance of the Protestant body of the whole empire would be so great, that all rivalry and jealousies between Protestants and Romanists would cease for ever; and it would not be necessary, for the safety of the empire at large, to curb the Romanists by any exclusive laws whatsoever a.’

If the Catholics should not be admitted into the United Parliament, still they will not then have to complain that they are excluded by a great majority of the nation; nor will they be any longer exposed to that sense of a mortifying and galling inferiority, which they say it is the habit, which I fear it is in the nature, of their local Legislature to excite, acted upon and stirred up to perpetual exertions of severe authority, by the jealousy and apprehensions to which the struggles of the Catholics, at their very doors in a manner and under their immediate eye, continually give rise.

We have seen the invalidity of the reasons by which some of the supposed disadvantages to Ireland likely to arise from the assembling of the common Legislature out of that island and at the metropolis of the empire, have been attempted to be proved. Another of those supposed disadvantages remains to be noticed. It is said the present state of things keeps the purse of the Irish nation in the honest hands of an Irish Parliament; and that if a number inferior to those chosen by Great Britain shall be sent from Ireland to an United Legislature, they will carry this purse over, and, laying it at the Minister's feet, deliver it up to his full power and uncontrouled discretion. The strict economy of the Irish Parliament, and its prudent resistance to the calls of the Executive Government for pecuniary supplies, however just its claim to that praise, will not, I believe, be admitted by the majority of those who have opposed a Union, either on this or the other side of the water. But has any body ever supposed that York, Bristol and Liverpool, or Limerick, Cork and Waterford, have run a greater risk than Westminster and Dublin, in confiding the power of their purse to Parliaments assembled in those last-mentioned cities? Suppose a partner in a mercantile house established in Cork to come to England on account of the partnership, and with full power to act for it; if such a person, during his absence in this country, should make a draft or accept a bill for the general behalf of the concern, would there be more danger of injury to the house from an improvident exercise of his power in that respect in such case, than if he had been deputed with equal authority to some other city in Ireland, to Derry or Belfast, and had exercised it there?

But when such topics as these are urged, do not Gentle-

ment forget that, according to the Resolutions^a proposed to be carried up to the Throne with this joint address, the rate of taxation between the two kingdoms is to be regulated by fixed rules and principles, to be agreed upon previous to the Union? The purse of Ireland therefore will, in a peculiar degree, have for its guardians not only the members Ireland shall elect, but those also chosen by Great Britain, as they can never concur in taxing that country without imposing a burden on this, in a proportion which Ireland as well as this country, and not in conjunction with it, but while still in its distinct and separate state, shall have sanctioned: and hence we have no occasion, here, to recur to the argument I some time since submitted to the House in order to shew the little ground there is to apprehend, that the general interests of Ireland will be overlooked or sacrificed by a United Legislature. In this material instance of taxation, the very selfishness of Great Britain herself will protect (since there are still those who will delight in viewing their interests as different) the separate purse of Ireland.

It seems to be chiefly for the purpose of meeting this argument that the alarms are raised to which I referred at the outset; lest the articles of Union should be infringed to the detriment of Ireland, whenever an infringement of them may be thought beneficial to Great Britain. To give colour to these apprehensions, we are told of the disavowal of the compact of 1782. This, it is said, must create a suspicion that any compact made in 1799 may be treated as lightly^b. I have shewn that no compact of the sort insisted on can have been intended in 1782; that whatever was then held out on the part of this country has been strictly adhered to; that the claim of the British

^a Vide 7th Resolution.

^b Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 99.

Parliament to legislate for Ireland has never been renewed, as I am satisfied it never will; but that when there is a compact between two distinct countries, if either of them shall break its part of it, the other may be able to resume its former situation, whereas in the case of an incorporating Union that is impossible; and that therefore such a compact can only be broken by lawless and revolutionary violence: which if it were attempted with success after a Union, would dissolve the whole political machine, and is no more to be dreaded than any other imaginable and possible subversion of the state.

What has been in fact the case as to the Scotch Union? No candid man who is versed in the history of his country since that memorable transaction will deny that its spirit, in all its clear and important parts, in all its ‘fundamental and essential conditions^a, has been adhered to ever since with scrupulous and sacred inviolability. The contrary, indeed, has been often, and was early attempted to be proved by the violence of faction and to serve the purposes of the day, though at the risk of no matter what public mischief and confusion. Such, among others, was the attempt in 1713, when, parties running high, the reluctance of the Scotch to submit to a general malt-tax was laid hold of, and their representatives persuaded, though upon a doubtful construction of one of the secondary clauses of the treaty, and one whose effect at best was only to be of a temporary and short duration, to raise a cry that those articles of the Union which were in favour of Scotland had been infringed; and even to bring forward a motion in Parliament^b for its formal dissolution; a motion which those who had encouraged it were far, I believe, from wishing to succeed, having done so merely

^a Article 25.

^b 1st June 1713. Lords’ Debates, vol. ii, p. 394. Continuation of Rapin, vol. xviii. p. 83.

with the hope that it would contribute to the overthrow of an administration to which they expected to succeed.

In hunting for objections on the present occasion, the circumstances of that occurrence have been eagerly looked into, and turned and twisted in a great variety of ways. But as one of the last, and certainly not the least of those who have conceived it to be their duty publicly to oppose the proposal of a Union between Ireland and Great Britain, scarcely appears to have thought they could be employed to any useful purpose on his side of the question, I do not deem it necessary for me to detain the House by any particular observations upon them.

I do not exactly understand, after the candid declaration, that the extension of the late income-tax is neither a breach of any of the articles of the Scotch Union, nor even suspected to have been meant as an evasion of it, why it is mentioned as affording an argument to persuade Ireland not to agree to a similar Union. ‘Time and circumstances,’ it is said, ‘have set aside the great beneficial difference in taxation which induced Scotland to consent to a Uniona.’ And we are told, ‘that, instead of taxing the land, the income arising out of the land is taxed, and that the effect is therefore the same to the Scotchman as if the articles of Union were brokenb.’ Sir, I should like to ask whether when the tea, the coffee, the wine, the sugar, &c. a Scotchman purchases with the income arising from his land is taxed at the same rate as those articles are in England, it might not as well be argued that this alters the settled proportion of land-tax, and amounts to a virtual breach of the articles of Union?

^a Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 96.

^b Ibid.

But what part of the history of that transaction proves that a difference in taxation was the ruling motive with Scotland upon that occasion ? The ratio of the tax on land between the two countries was settled on particular grounds, in my opinion reasonable in themselves, and satisfactory to the parties concerned ; they may be seen stated at length in *De Foe's* book. In regard to the taxation of a particular sort of beer or ale used only in Scotland, a difference was also stipulated for in favour of that country^a, and likewise an exemption from certain temporary duties then existing in England^b, and from any tax to be imposed on malt during the war.^c But as to all the other great duties of customs and excise then in force in England, and all duties to be imposed after the expiration of those temporary taxes, except in the case of the sort of beer I have mentioned, an equality of rates was expressly agreed to^d, though with this equitable qualification, that, besides a certain sum to be paid immediately, a fund should be created equal to such portion of the share of the common revenue which would be raised on Scotland, as might be applicable to the then debts of England ; to be applied, in the first place, to the extinction of the debts of Scotland, and afterwards to objects of local improvement there ||.

I conceive that Scotland, when she agreed to the Union, looked to far other advantages than a general and supposed beneficial difference in taxation, a difference she could always insure without a Union. She looked to advantages which, by increasing her wealth and general income, would enable her to flourish under an equal ratio of contribution,—the points the two parties had agreed on excepted,—to the common exigencies of

^a Art. 7.^b Art. 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.^c Art. 14. *supra*, p. 102.^d Art. 7, 8, 14, 15.^e Art. 15.

the United State. Whether she has been disappointed in that motive for her conduct, and that prospect to which she looked forward, I will now proceed to inquire.

Indeed, that Scotland has thriven through the whole course of the present century to an extraordinary degree, in all the branches of national wealth and improvement, is a fact notorious to all who have attended to the progress of that part of the kingdom, but particularly to such as are acquainted with, or most interested in her concerns. The truth of the fact therefore does not seem to be controverted; but it is said ‘ the argument is shallow which attributes every increase of trade, of population, of wealth in Scotland from that day to this, to the Union, as if nothing was due to the progressive state of the world during a century, and Scotland alone, amidst surrounding nations, was to have remained stationary;’ and it is added, ‘ if such was the viciousness of her constitution, the miseries of her constitution, the miseries of her situation, or the depression of her resources, well might she have accepted any terms.’ I do not believe it was ever the intention of any body to ascribe all the improvements of Scotland exclusively to the Union. The general causes alluded to have no doubt operated there, but one might ask in this place, why those causes are supposed to have been of such powerful agency in Scotland since 1707, but of none in Ireland before and since 1782?

It is often difficult to ascertain with exact precision the specific causes of national prosperity, and to assign to each its true share in the general effect. If the Union put Scotland in a secure situation of participating in the influence

* Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 104.

of events and circumstances which were destined to meliorate in a greater or less degree all the parts of the British dominions, much was gained by that country, and thus far I think I have already proved. I have referred to the known oppression exercised towards her by her more powerful neighbour while they had separate Parliaments, the continuance or renewal of which was, by the Union, effectually prevented. I have moreover shewn that what England then practised against Scotland, though to her own detriment, and England and Great Britain long afterwards are accused of having practised against Ireland, may be again practised against her by a separate government remaining in this country. This is no threat; none now living will ever be so unwise or so unjust as to attempt it. But can they entail their wisdom or their justice on succeeding ages and their yet unborn successors in influence or power ?

Arguments and facts, however, satisfactory and numerous, might easily be adduced to shew that the Union has not merely proved of this negative advantage to Scotland, but has been in a great degree the direct cause of her increased prosperity. On this head the House cannot have forgot the powerful and convincing statement made on a former day by a Right Hon. Gentleman peculiarly skilled in the history and situation of that country. I shall therefore content myself with adding only a very few circumstances to what was detailed upon that occasion.

If I can make it probable that the trade of Scotland has increased since the year 1707, in a greater ratio than that of England, I think I shall have a right to conclude that this excess in the improvement of the former country has
been

been owing to the Union. That transaction was not likely to benefit England in the same proportion; other general causes of melioration would probably do so to a greater extent, from her superior advantages of climate, situation, and capital.

The facts I have to state are these : The Scotch duties of excise at the time of the Union amounted only to 30,000*l.* those of customs to 35,000*l.*—or, together to 65,000*l.* At that time the customs of England were 1,341,559*l.* the excise 947,612*l.*—together, 2,289,161*l.*^a According to the account annexed to the 23d Report of the late Committee of Finance, it appears that the gross total receipt from the customs of Scotland in the year 1797 was 403,536*l.*, from the excise of that country 958,173*l.* Those two sums added together make 1,361,709*l.* In England the gross amount received in the same year from the customs was 6,124,346*l.*, that from the excise 11,080,044*l.*—together 17,204,390*l.* Now, Sir, that sum, large as it is, falls extremely short indeed of what it should have been if the advance in its amount had been in the same proportion as that which appears to have taken place in regard to the customs and excise in Scotland; for it will be found that by that ratio the amount for England would have been very near forty-eight millions^c.

It may indeed with truth be said, that the rate of those duties was very considerably lower in Scotland than in England at the time of the Union; but, although by the stipulations of that treaty they were (with the exceptions I

^a *De Foe*, p. 123. Treaty of Union, Art. xv. ft. 5 Ann. c. 8.

^c 65,000 : 2,289,161 :: 1,361,709 : 47,956,479 $\frac{1}{8} \frac{1}{6} \frac{4}{6} \frac{9}{6}$ *l.*

have mentioned) to become the same after it in both countries, yet Parliament, authorized so to do under the 14th article of the Treaty, has in truth so greatly favoured Scotland since in respect of two of the main objects of excise revenue, malt and distilled spirits, that the first in that country does not now, and did not in the year 1797, pay more than one half, and the other not two-thirds of the English duties^c. It is also to be observed, that a heavy duty on many articles consumed in Scotland, such as tea, sugar, coffee, &c. &c. and which is therefore in truth paid by that country, is now collected in England.

But if another mode of comparison should be preferred, we may find the materials for it in *De Foe*. That writer informs us^d that it had been estimated that the custom and excise of Scotland, if put on the same foot with those taxes in England at the time of the Union, would have produced, —customs 70,000*l.*—excise 40,000*l.*—in all 110,000*l.* Now, even this sum will be found to be, to the produce of those duties in England at that time, not as the present produce in Scotland is to that in England, but as it is to a sum exceeding that by much more than one-half, viz. 28,337,919*l.*^e

Upon the whole, therefore, I think it is impossible not to see that the produce of those two great branches of re-

^c The duty on salt used in Scotland is now but in the proportion of 4 to 10 to that in England, 38 Geo. III. c. 89. The post-office duty is also much lower in Scotland, 39 Geo. III. c. 77.

* P. 188.

^e 110,000 : 2,289,161 : : 1,361,709 : 28,337,919 $\frac{46149}{100000}$ *l.*

venue,

venue, which may be taken as tolerably exact measures of the trade, both foreign and internal, of each country, has, even upon the supposition of an equality of rates, increased in a much greater proportion in Scotland than in England.

But we are asked, ‘ Has Scotland advanced in prosperity since the Union as much as Ireland? ’ Any one who had given entire credit to the frequent complaints of tyrannical oppression exercised by this country almost constantly towards Ireland, might be apt to conceive, that whatever should make it probable that the improvement of Scotland had done much more than keep pace with that of England during that period, must tend, *à fortiori*, to shew that it must have greatly surpassed that of Ireland. But knowing how often those complaints have been made from party considerations, or dictated by spleen and ill humour, I do not think we ought to content ourselves with such a general presumption.

No single branch of trade or manufacture, common to the two countries, can afford a satisfactory criterion by which to decide the question. The linen trade has been compared, and calculations have been stated to shew that Ireland has outrun Scotland very much in that branch. But linen, though a great, is far from the only considerable manufacture of Scotland. It is admitted to be the only one of any moment in Ireland. Perhaps a comparison of the annual revenue of each will furnish a better test.

* Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 104.

I think

I think it will not be denied, that, to meet the extraordinary expenses of the times, the taxes in Ireland have been strained of late to nearly as high a pitch as is consistent with the ease, comfort, or industry of its inhabitants; at least, whoever is acquainted with the two countries will allow, to judge from general appearances in each, that the people of Scotland as are little overpowered by the pressure of their share of the public burdens of this kingdom, as those of Ireland are by the taxes levied on them. If I may take this for granted, it will follow, without going into the different rates of duties imposed on the different objects of taxation in each, that, of the two, that country which, in proportion to its population and natural advantages, yields the greatest annual amount of public income must be in the most prosperous situation.

Now how does the case stand? Scotland is acknowledged to contain much fewer inhabitants than Ireland, though in extent the first somewhat exceeds the latter country; the soil of Scotland is much the least fertile; its climate is not so temperate as that of Ireland; and its ports and other natural advantages for foreign trade, one great source of revenue, are much inferior.

^c The duty on distilled spirits in 1797, was much higher in Ireland than in Scotland, and is so still. That on malt in Scotland is now but $7\frac{3}{4}d.$ $\frac{1}{2}\%$ per Winchester bushel, or 5s. 5d. per quarter; in Ireland it is 6s. 6d. Ir. or 6s. Br. per barrel. A barrel Ir. is about 5 bushels, a quarter 8 bushels. The duty in England is but 10s. 6d. per quarter. The rates of the postage of letters in Ireland and Scotland in 1797, were nearly the same, and, I believe, continue to be so.

Yet,

Yet, with so many differences in favour of Ireland, it will be found that the gross revenue levied in Scotland in the year before the last, which is the latest period of which I have been able to get a full account for both countries, came within considerably less than 100,003*l.* of that of Ireland. The latter amounted to 1,965,130*l.* Ir. equal to 1,813,966*l.* Br.^d; the former to 1,734,472*l.* leaving a difference only of 79,494*l.* According to the many advantages I have just stated as belonging to Ireland, if the two countries were in an equal degree of prosperity, the revenue of Ireland ought to have exceeded that of Scotland in an infinitely greater proportion.

I have spoken of *gross* revenue; but the expense of collection is so much less in Scotland than in Ireland (probably also an effect of the Union), that on the comparison of the *net* produce of each, the balance turns very considerably in favour of Scotland; for, in the same year, the net produce of the Scotch revenue was 1,487,036*l.*; that of Ireland only 1,437,516*l.* Ir. or 1,325,937*l.* ^e Br. Here the difference is no less than 160,099*l.* in favour of Scotland, being the sum which that country contributed more than Ireland, in that year, to the general aggregate expenditure of the empire, considered as a whole.

The statement as to Scotland I have extracted from the accurate reports of the Finance Committee. Those respecting Ireland come from a source which I can rely upon as perfectly authentic.

^d 13*l.* Ir. make 12*l.* Br. and 13 : 12 :: 1,965,130 : 1,813,966 ^{$\frac{2}{3}$} *l.*

^e 13 : 12 :: 1,437,516 : 1,326,937 ^{$\frac{7}{13}$} *l.*

It is said, the trade of Glasgow, the chief commercial city of Scotland, has decreased since the American war^d. If this were correct, I do not see what inference could be drawn from it in regard to the effect of the Union. But I have extremely good authority for stating, that although the merchants of that city have lost the Virginia trade in consequence of the American revolution, their commerce and navigation are on the whole very considerably augmented. They have now, particularly, a very extensive traffic with the West Indies, of which they had none formerly; and, as to their manufactures, that of cotton is immense, and the rest are in general at least quadrupled within the last twenty years.

But has the population of Scotland kept pace in due proportion with that of Ireland^e? Sir, the population of Ireland is, as I have said, undoubtedly considerably greater, in proportion to its extent, than that of Scotland; but if the much smaller number of inhabitants of the latter possess as much or more useful wealth, that is, if they can with equal ease to themselves, which I have endeavoured to render probable, contribute as much or more towards the exigencies of the public as those of the former, it is very difficult to see how Ireland can be considered as in a state of more rapid progression in point of riches and individual or national prosperity than Scotland.

I cannot help suspecting, however, that there are some great mistakes on the subject of the population of these kingdoms, and the progressive increase of numbers in each during the present century; that the numbers in

^d Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 105.

^e Ibid.

Ireland have of late been greatly exaggerated, or those in Scotland (and indeed in England) much under-rated.

It is said, the population of Scotland at the Union was a million, and that it is now but a million and a half; whereas Ireland, whose inhabitants then were little more than a million and a half, has now a population of near four millions and a half^a. I do not know from whence these numbers, or at least some of them, may have been taken; but statements might have been found, according to which the comparison would have turned out still more to the advantage of the argument for the sake of which it has been made.

According to *De Foe*, the number of inhabitants in Scotland at the time of the Union was, instead of one, esteemed to be two millions^b; and most of the modern calculations have reduced them in our time to the number, stated, of about a million and a half^c, some considerably under^d. On the other hand, all the authorities I have happened to meet with for raising the population of Ireland so high as four millions and a half, according to what I have just now mentioned, except that most respectable one to which I then meant to refer, are to be found in publications which furnish others of equal weight for taking it still higher, namely, at five millions^d.

But,

^a Mr. *Foster's* Speech, p. 165.

^b *Ibid.* p. 165.

^c *Chalmers's* Estimate, p. 224, note; Sir *J. Sinclair's* Statistical Account of Scotland, vol. xx. p. 621.

^d Dr. *Webster's* Tables. Dr. *Webster*, in 1755, made them only 1,265,380; Sir *J. Sinclair*, in 1798, 1,526,492.

^e Four millions and a half Messrs. *Hamilton Rowan* and *Tone: Jackson's* Trial, p. 80: Report of the Secret Committee of the House of Commons of Ireland, 1798, Appendix No. xxii. p. 195: Mr. Keough's Authentic Statement

But, Sir, is it conceivable that Scotland, having in the last hundred years improved so much in trade, manufactures, and agriculture, having been visited by no violent epidemical distempers, and certainly not having on the whole suffered more, notwithstanding the two short rebellions in 1715 and 1745, than Ireland from internal disturbances, should have experienced either a diminution of one fourth or more, or even but an increase of one third of her population, while that of Ireland has been multiplied four or five fold^a?

It is true, more authentic calculations do not carry the population of the latter so high. Dr. Price, in 1773, reckoned it only 1,908,207, and he then computed that of Scotland at one million and a half^b. Lord Auckland, in his Letters to Lord Carlisle in 1779, says, 'the common large calculation' of the numbers in Ireland was at that time two millions^c. Lord North, in the debate on the Irish Propositions in 1785, stated them at 2,300,000^d.

Statement of the Proceedings of the Roman Catholics of Dublin, 9th of April 1795. p. 37. Five millions, Mr. Lewins, *ibid.* p. 31. Mr. Emmett; Report of the Secret Committee of the House of Lords of Ireland, 1798, Appendix, No. vi. p. 33.

^a I think I could state, from a comparison of the respective rates and produce of the duties on distilled Spirits in Scotland and Ireland, very strong presumptive reasons for believing that the quantity consumed is as great in the former as in the latter. If we suppose the individual use of whiskey in each to be nearly the same, this would lead to a very different proportion in the respective population of each, from that furnished by the common calculations.

^b Price on Reversionary Payments, p. 185, note.

^c P. 82.

^d 30th May 1785, Parliamentary Register, vol. xviii. p. 425.

and

and he does not appear to have been contradicted. Indeed in the same debate, a Gentleman who 'is a native of that country, admitted them to be under two millions and a halfa. So late as 1792, Mr. *Burke*, throughout his Letter to Sir *Hercules Langrishe*, takes them at three millions.^b In that year, however, the subject having been much attended to in Ireland, particularly by the late Mr. *Bushe*, one of the commissioners of the revenue there, according to the accounts which were then exhibited to the House of Commons, the number of houses in Ireland was computed at 701,102, which, reckoning 5 persons to each house, gives 3,505,510 for the number of inhabitants; at $5\frac{1}{2}$, 3,856,061; and at 6, 4,206,612. Dr. *Beaufort* thinks it reasonable, 'when we take into consideration the great populousness of the poorest cottages, the many crowded houses in Dublin and other large towns, and that the university, barracks, hospitals, and public offices are not included in the hearth-money returns' (according to which the number of houses had been calculated,) to rate the number of persons, on the hypothesis of only 701,102 houses, at the medium reckoning of $5\frac{1}{2}$ to each house, and to state the population on the whole at about 3,850,000.^c He appears to have had communications with Mr. *Bushe* on the subject, and therefore this may be conjectured to have been also the opinion of that very accurate and intelligent person.

This last computation may, perhaps, be near the truth. My scepticism is chiefly with regard to the received opinions as to the population of Scotland, concerning

^a Parliamentary Register, vol. xviii. p. 446.

^b P 69. 72. 74.

^c Memoir of a Map of Ireland, 142.

which, I think, I could adduce many facts and arguments, besides the general considerations I have hinted at, to render it probable that it approaches nearer that of Ireland, tho' no doubt very considerably under it, than has of late been generally supposed.

Among the reasons drawn from the supposed peculiar situation of Scotland before the Union, which are thought to shew that such a measure might be very advantageous to that country, without being so to Ireland, are two, concerning which I will say a very few words. They have been adduced, I presume, principally as instances of the comparative 'viciousness^a of the constitution of Scotland, and 'to justify the opinion that it was not worth preserving^b.'

1. One is, 'that the two Houses sat together,' i. e. that there were not two Houses, 'and that the King, by his 'power of creating Peers, could at any time overpower 'the voices of the Commons^c.'

2. The other, 'that the Scotch Parliament, even with 'this imperfect constitution, had not a deliberative power, 'because it could discuss no subject but what was previously 'prepared by the Lords of the Articles^d.'

1. As to the first, there certainly was but one House in the Scotch Parliament, which continued in that respect to resemble the original form of the English; but

^a Mr. Foster's Speech, 104.

^b Ibid. p. 102.

^c P. 101.

^d Ibid.

it is a point of considerable doubt whether an act of that Parliament (which was originally considered as composed of four *distinct* estates, and after the abolition of the prelacy, and to the very last, of three; 1. Noblemen: 2. Barons, *i. e.* representatives of shires; and, 3. Burrows, *i. e.* members for boroughs) was valid without a concurrence of the majority of each estate. There are great authorities on both sides of the question^a; and the very doubt seems to prove that, in all cases of importance, such concurrence had, in fact, taken place. In the lists of the divisions on the treaty of Union, preserved by *De Foe*, it appears that the votes of each estate were kept distinct; and that, on every question divided upon and carried, there was a majority of each^b. Be this point, however, as it may, it would seem that the Crown had not found it expedient to exercise its prerogative, by creating an excess in the number of Peers; for, in fact, at the time of the Union, the whole number of Noblemen in the Parliament of Scotland was but 154, while that of the Commoners was 156^c. Early in the preceding reign no less than twenty-six members for counties had been added at once to the representative part of the legislature of Scotland^d; afterwards an additional Parliamentary borough was erected; and a very short time before the the Union, Mr. *Fletcher* of Saltoun had proposed to provide by statute, ‘that in all time coming, ‘for every nobleman that should be created there should ‘be a baron added to the parliament^e.’ His motion

^a *Craig de Feudis*, lib. i. dieg. 7. § 11. *Mackenzie's Institutes*, p. 402. *Wight on Elections*, p. 83.

^b *De Foe*, Appendix, F. xx. p. 662. E. xx. p. 666.

^c *De Foe*, *Wight*, *Robertson*, &c.

^d Sc. Acts, 1st Parl. 2d ses. Will. and M. c. 11. 1690. p. 288.

^e *Fletcher's Works*, p. 283.

did not indeed pass ; but from the known history of the act of security, which the popular interest in that very Parliament had been able not only to carry there, but to force the Queen to assent to, is it too much to conclude that if the method of outnumbering the Commons by creating new Peers had been attempted, which is supposed to have been so easy, such a motion would have been less unsuccessful ?

2. As to the Lords of the Articles, what has been observed on that subject is clearly the effect of oversight ; many years before the Union, by an act of the Scotch Parliament^a, the institution had been totally abolished, and it made as little a part of the constitution of Scotland in 1707, as the Court of Star-chamber or High Commission Court did of that of England.

Before I quit this subject, of the advantages Scotland has derived from the Union, I must beg leave to take notice of a passage or two in ‘ *Smith’s Wealth of Nations* ;’ from which, taken by themselves, and, even in that detached state singularly misunderstood and misinterpreted, inferences have been drawn or surmised, as if that judicious and impartial writer had not conceived that that event had tended to improve the prosperity of his native country. *

We have been told here, that he has imputed the increased trade of Scotland to the establishment of banks.—He has certainly said, that within five-and-twenty or thirty years from the time in which he was writing, many private banking companies had been erected in every considerable town and in many country villages of

^a Sc. Acts, 1st Parl. Will. & M. 2d sess. c. 5. 1690, p. 220.

Scotland, and he gives it as his opinion, ‘ that the country
 ‘ had derived great benefit from that circumstance^a.’ I
 have no intention to question that opinion. The rea-
 sons by which he supports it have great force; though,
 by the by, it is a remarkable circumstance, that the
 period he mentions will be found very nearly to coin-
 cide with that from which Chief Baron *Foster* had dated
 the beginning of the great spirit of improvement in Ireland;
 and which I have mentioned as the epoch of an accelerated
 progression in that respect throughout the whole of the
 British dominions. But it will be found that Dr.
Smith, in the very passage in question, is very far from
 considering the banks, either public or private, as the exclu-
 sive cause of the increase of trade in Scotland. He says,
 ‘ he had heard it asserted, that the trade of Glasgow had
 ‘ been doubled in about fifteen years after the first erection
 ‘ of banks there, and that the trade of Scotland had been
 ‘ more than quadruped since the first erection of the public
 ‘ banks at Edinburgh; one in 1695, the other in 1727 :’
 ‘ and immediately adds, if either of them have increased in
 ‘ this proportion, it seems to be an effect too great to be
 ‘ accounted for by the sole operation of this cause ^b!’

Other passages, however, are mentioned as if directly
 in point, to shew that he did not think the Union pro-
 moted trade or manufactures in Scotland^c. One is as
 follows : ‘ Of *all* commercial advantages which Scotland
 ‘ has derived from the Union, the rise in the price of cattle
 ‘ is perhaps the greatest^d.’ This is an extraordinary

^a Vol. i. p. 442, 7th edition.

^c Ibid. p. 443.

^b Mr. *Foster*'s Speech, p. 106.

^d *Smith*, vol. i. p. 348.

proof that he ‘ did not think that it derived *any* commercial advantages from it.’ But it seems this must be a very poor advantage to *Scotland*, because the policy of *Ireland* has been to impose duties in order to check the export of live cattle^a. Sir, till all the circumstances of the two cases shall have been compared, till it is made out that the imposition of those restrictive duties is good policy in *Ireland*, till it is then proved that, being so, it would have been good policy in regard to *Scotland*, and till it is shewn that because a legislative Union between *Scotland* and *England* opened a free export of cattle from the former, therefore a similar Union between *Ireland* and *Great Britain* must necessarily open a like exportation from *Ireland*; till these positions are established, I do not see what possible advantage the able Advocate who has resorted to the authority of *Dr. Smith* on this point, can derive from it in support of his argument. *Dr. Smith’s* favourite doctrine, if my memory does not mislead me, is, that agriculture is preferable to commerce, and that the commerce most connected with agriculture is the best^b; and he mentions the effect of the Union in regard to the price of cattle in *Scotland*, to shew that ‘ it has not only raised the value of lands in the Highlands, but has been the principal cause of the improvement of the low country’^c.

Another passage referred to for the same purpose is this: ‘ The price of wool was reduced by the Union excluding it from the great markets in *Europe*, and confining it to the narrow one of *England*.’ Permit

^a *Mr. Foster’s Speech*, p. 106.

^b Vol. iii. p. 136, &c. &c. &c.

^c *Smith*, vol. i. p. 348, 349.

^d *Mr. Foster’s Speech*, p. 106.

me to add to this the part of the context which immediately follows, viz. ‘ The value of the greater part of the lands
 ‘ in the southern counties, which are chiefly a sheep coun-
 ‘ try, would have been very deeply affected by this event
 ‘ had not the rise in the price of butcher’s meat fully com-
 ‘ pensated the fall in the price of wool.’ Taking the whole
 therefore together, which I suppose will be allowed to be
 the fair way, it is clear the author thought this restriction
 had, on the whole, been of no positive disadvantage. But
 it is not a restriction confined to Scotland, nor any essential
 or necessary part of the treaty of Union; it was part of a
 general system for the whole united kingdom, thought at the
 time,—and from the continuance of the laws against ex-
 portation, we must infer that it is still thought so by the Le-
 gislature,—to be for the good of the whole. I am not now
 called upon, if I were competent, to give an opinion on
 this *vexata questio*; I will only observe, that the Parliament
 of Scotland had long acted on the same principle^b; that if
 the United Legislature shall ever come to think that it is
 sounder policy to allow the exportation of wool, there is no-
 thing in the articles of Union to prevent the extension of
 that freedom to Scotland; and that in such case it probably
 would be extended to that country. In the mean time it
 will be recollected that, for the consent of Scotland at the
 time to admit of the prohibition, a valuable consideration
 was to be paid out of the general equivalent stipulated for
 by the 15th article^c of the treaty.

Indeed, Sir, I cannot disguise my astonishment that

^a *Smith*, vol. i. p. 369.

^b Scotch Acts, 7th Parl. Jac. 6. c. 113. An. 1581, 1st Parl. Car. 2. fef. 1. c. 40. An. 1661.

^c Vide *De Foe*, p, 403. 406. 444.

Dr. *Smith* should have been called as a witness on the present occasion ; but as he has been produced, I hope I may be allowed to use the legal privilege permitted in such cases of a cross-examination ; and I will shew the House by reading a passage where he expressly treats of a Union between Ireland and Great Britain, what the real sentiments of that author were on the subject. The Gentlemen cannot dispute either the credit or competency of an authority to which they themselves have chosen to refer.

‘ By a Union with Great Britain, Ireland would gain
 ‘ *besides the freedom of trade*, other advantages much more
 ‘ important. By the Union with *England* the middling and
 ‘ inferior ranks of people in Scotland gained a complete de-
 ‘ liverance from the power of an aristocracy which had be-
 ‘ fore oppressed them. By a Union with *Great Britain* the
 ‘ greater part of the people of all ranks in Ireland would
 ‘ gain equally complete deliverance from a much more op-
 ‘ pressive aristocracy, not founded, like that of Scotland,
 ‘ in the natural and respectable distinctions of birth and for-
 ‘ tune, but the most odious of all distinctions, which more
 ‘ than any other animate the insolence of the oppressors,
 ‘ and the hatred and indignation of the oppressed, and which
 ‘ commonly render the inhabitants of the same country more
 ‘ hostile than those of other countries ever are.—Without
 ‘ a Union with Great Britain the inhabitants of Ireland are
 ‘ not likely, for many ages, to consider themselves as one
 ‘ people ^a.’

Among the evils with which the opponents of a Union alarm the people of Ireland as likely to befall their country from that measure, are, an increased emigration, and the

^a Vol. iii. p. 460.

permanent or temporary non-residence of a great number of persons of rank and opulence ^a.

The general complaint against absentees is of a very long standing. For my own part, I have never been of the number of those who imagine that law and positive regulation can with effect, or ought in propriety to be applied in restriction of the natural liberty which belongs to every individual, of fixing his residence, exercising his talents and industry, or spending his income, wherever he thinks it most agreeable. A general *ne exeant regno* would be a strange part of the system of any government, and that country must be of a singular description which requires that its natives should be imprisoned within its limits by the sanction of penal law and pecuniary mulcts. If you can but restore, or rather establish tranquility, police, the security of life and property, in Ireland, depend upon it the happy soil and salubrious climate of that favoured island, its almost unrivalled advantages for trade and agriculture, added to the powerful sentiment which attaches mankind in general, with a fond prepossession, to the place which gave them birth, will fix at home, or attract with all the riches their abilities or diligence may have acquired for them in other parts of the world, such numbers of Irishmen now prompted to emigrate or detained from returning by the unsettled state of their native country, as will more than counterbalance whatever non-residence may arise from the periodical sittings of the common Parliament in Great Britain.

That non-residence will be only occasional. It will

^a Mr. Foster's Speech, p. 62. 64. 91. 93. Vide some important observations on the subject of absentees, Substance of Lord Sheffield's Speech, p. 29, &c.

reach little further than the members of the Legislature and their families. The seat of judicature and the local executive government will, I presume, continue where they are; and I believe those who frequent the gayer walks of life will not suppose that the votaries of pleasure and dissipation in Ireland will think the circumstance of the Irish Parliamentary representation resorting to London any great addition to the allurements of that place. That part of the population of this metropolis and of Bath will remain pretty much as before.

Indeed, I cannot help thinking there are several very strong reasons in favour of the probability, that, on the whole, the fear entertained of a drain of wealth and population by an increase of absentees would not be verified by the event.

Will the House give me leave here to recall to their recollection the observation of a Noble Lord^a on this part of the argument, which struck me as of great weight, namely, that the importance of a seat in the united and imperial Legislature, the election to which, whether in Great Britain or Ireland, would then be indifferent to many persons anxious to obtain it, would be felt by men possessed of property and interest in the latter kingdom as much greater than that of one in her present local Parliament. They would therefore have a more powerful motive for attending to the cultivation of their influence there; and this could only be done effectually by frequent residence on their estates, and the expenditure of a considerable part of their Irish income, perhaps of their English also, in Ireland. This must particularly happen in regard to county elections, in favour of which sort of representation I make no scruple to acknowledge my pre-

^a Lord Hawkebury.

dilection, and to those in towns where the right is popular and extensive^d.

If the absence of persons of distinction and fortune were to increase, we have heard the very respectable opinion of an Honourable Gentleman^e, who seemed to speak on the subject from reflection and personal observation, and who must be considered as deserving peculiar attention in regard to it, that the merchant and manufacturer would probably feel their means and disposition for exertion expand, and their efforts become more successful; that they would, as it were, breathe a freer air, by the removal from their neighbourhood, of the splendour and dignity of rank and hereditary opulence; and that, as the flourishing condition of trade and manufactures naturally tends to augment the population of a country, this effect would much more than counteract the mischief apprehended. The Honourable Gentleman spoke indeed with liberal and laudable sentiments of respect for that aristocracy, which forms so essential a part of our excellent constitution, but he seemed to entertain the idea that commerce and industry, though they live by the demands and consumption of the great, thrive best at a distance from them—

*Urit enim fulgore suo qui prægravat artes
Infra se positas.*

With great deference, however, to the Honourable Gentleman, I must express my doubts on this point, though it is one of which I acknowledge him to be much better qualified to judge than I am. I doubt the justness of his opi-

^d I think we have also Mr. *Foster's* authority for this: 'In county elections and popular boroughs no man now an absentee can expect to be chosen.' p. 91.

^e Mr. *Peele*.

nion, because it both differs from the most general sentiments, and militates against the arguments in favour of that frequent and easy intercourse between the different, but intimately connected orders and classes of our great civil and political system, which is so gratifying to our feelings, and seems so consonant to reason.

But as to the supposed tendency of a parliamentary Union to produce an increased emigration and non-residence of the great in Ireland, I own I consider the experimental knowledge we have, in this as in other respects, derived from the case of Scotland, as of much more weight than any conjectural *à priori* arguments which can be suggested on the one side or the other.

It has often been stated, and indeed never denied, that no nobility and gentry reside more at home than those of that country. They almost universally pass the summer on their estates, occupied in the pleasures of rural hospitality and the improvement of the national agriculture by encouragement and example; and many of them spend the rest of the year in Edinburgh. The wonderful advances that Capital of the country has made in its size, population, wealth, convenience, and elegance, since the Union and removal of its Parliament, are notorious from universal report to all, and from personal knowledge to many who hear me. I will not say that the Union has caused this; that it has had a chief share in producing the great general improvement in Scotland, I think I have shewn to be extremely probable; but it is evident, at least, that the Union has not prevented the increased prosperity of Edinburgh.

Yet the advocates against that measure in Scotland were

as

as loud and as positive in their prophecies, that this ancient seat of Majesty, on the removal of the Legislature, would sink into poverty, misery, and desolation, as many in Ireland have been of late, on similar grounds, in foretelling to the great and respectable metropolis of that kingdom, that its ruin will be the infallible and speedy consequence of the measure now under consideration. Indeed the common people of Dublin have had this topic so impressed on their minds in every possible way, that many of them, I believe, have at last been brought almost to give literal credit to the ironical prediction, that when the Parliament shall cease to sit there, the town will become such a perfect *rus in urbe*, as to furnish a new source of provisions for victualling the British fleet by the extensive pastures into which its streets and squares are to be converted. It seems almost ridiculous to say that such sort of arguments can have succeeded, yet I verily believe they have to a very considerable degree. Nay, more, I have seen it asserted in some publication against the proposed Union, with a confidence which hardly could have existed without the author's own belief of the fact, that Edinburgh, whatever may be pretended to the contrary, has, in truth, been in a constant state of decay ever since the loss of the Parliament. The only answer such an ignorant assertion seems to deserve, is that ludicrous one I have read in one of the polemical writers in favour of the measure, who supposes himself to be told by a correspondent that he has found with regret the fact was really so; for that upon inquiry among some gentlemen and ladies, natives of Scotland, and inhabitants of Edinburgh, they had assured him, that that ancient city had suffered so very much from the fatal event of the Union, that the Scotch had been actually under the necessity of building a very large new one close to it.

Sir, a learned gentleman of our sister kingdom, whose tract against the Union is certainly the performance of a man of abilities^d, has, however, a very curious way of arguing on the fact, which he admits, that the Union has not occasioned emigration and non-residence in Scotland; but the analogy of which, in regard to what there may be reason to expect in the case of Ireland, he will by no means allow. The fact he admits in these very strong terms: ‘ Can there be adduced five instances of men of rank in Scotland, however powerful and extended their English connexions, whose chief or least temporary residence is not in Scotland?’ And again: A Scotch absentee is ‘ only a political or commercial speculator, who will in the end enrich and adorn his native country: his money, acquired where it may be, and after absence ever so long, centers there^f.’

But this, it seems, is all the anomalous effect of a peculiar nationality in the Scotch^e, which a similarity of circumstances has no tendency to produce in any other people, and especially not in the Irish; though many of the inhabitants of one part of that country are not very distant descendants from Scottish ancestors, and most of the rest throughout the kingdom are probably either sprung from one common Celtic stock with the Highlanders, or else of that Saxon or Teutonic race who appear, in the early ages of the Christian æra, to have over-run and settled themselves in all the low country of Scotland as well as of England.

^d A Reply, &c. by *Richard Jebb*, Esq.

^e Ibid. p. 49.

^f Ibid.

^g Ibid.

An Irishman, it seems, is a being of a different sort. ‘ Scarcely an instance,’ it is said, ‘ occurs of the wealth and influence obtained by Irishmen in England, producing advantage to Ireland : they seem ashamed of the name, and eager to divest themselves of all pretensions to it.’¹

Alas ! Sir, it is painful to see that men of understanding can resort to such grounds of opposition, or suffer themselves to fall into reasonings and opinions scarcely fit for the most ordinary minds, and entirely unworthy of the cultivated sense which seems to belong to this gentleman, and ought to be the attribute of all who profess themselves either lawyers or statesmen.

If the difference in the general conduct of the Irish and Scotch were really as notorious as he has persuaded himself it is, the experiment of the effects of an Union upon the former has not been tried, and he does not appear to have made any inquiry how the case stood as to absentees from Scotland previous to 1707. He found an easier solution of the supposed difference in the hackneyed imputation or praise of Scotch nationality ; he says it is *a praise*,² and when duly regulated I think it is, though I verily believe not more due to the Scotch, than, where circumstances happen to be similar, to the Yorkshire, Cornish, or Welsh man ; or indeed to Frenchmen, Swedes, Danes, Germans, or Italians.

I imagine this gentleman would take it very ill, I think with reason, if a stranger were to pronounce so
s
unjust

¹ A Reply, &c. by *Richard Jebb*, Esq. p. 49.

² Ibid, p. 50.

unjust a judgment as he has done upon his countrymen. Unjust I certainly think it is; I myself could mention various striking instances to the contrary of what he has alledged. I could select from many others the example of a respectable Nobleman of that country, who, after filling with great honour and credit some of the principal offices of government here, retired to Ireland, and successfully devoted the remainder of his days to the improvement of that part of the kingdom where his chief property lay; having ever been, through the course of his political life, a watchful guardian of the interests and well-being of the whole. I mean the late Lord *Hillsborough*, whom I mention with the more pleasure, because he who understood the affairs of Ireland so well, is known to have been always a strenuous and anxious advocate for a legislative Union. Sir, I could in like manner specify examples of Irish gentlemen in other walks of life, who having by their talents and exertions in remote countries, in the East and in the West, acquired eminence and fortune, have returned to their native land, and, vesting their riches in purchases there, have become active and useful magistrates, able commanders of the national troops, and members both of the one and the other House of Parliament.

But even if it were true, that such instances have been more rare in Ireland than in Scotland, would it be any very extravagant conjecture to suppose, that the real reasons have been the greater tranquillity which prevails in the one in consequence of an Union, and the more turbulent and unsettled state of the other for want of it? Would not those indisputable circumstances of difference account for such a difference in the conduct of the natives of the two countries, more satisfactorily than supposed distinctions

tions of national character, which may serve to amuse in a farce, or occasion merriment or quarrels in a coffee-house, but can never be entitled to hold a place in grave discussion or serious debate?

But, Sir, the Gentlemen who in this place have resisted the progress of the business now again brought before us;—as well those who object to the competency and general expediency;—as well the very few who I think have gone the length of declaring a rooted opinion, that the Union never can, at any time, or with any sort of consent, be advisable;—as those who profess, some a *belief*, others even a *wish*, that it may at some future period be adopted;—all appear to concur in contending, that the present time and occasion are unfit; that the people of Ireland are not prepared; that they have not been habituated to the contemplation of the measure, as those of Scotland had been for above a century; that they have inveterate prejudices against it, which have now universally manifested themselves, and which ought to be first by gentle and gradual means removed: whereas, as has also been alledged, it was always the favourite project of Scotland. Lastly, two other plans have been propounded,—plans widely different the one from the other,—by which it is supposed that those disorders and misfortunes of Ireland which a legislative Union would only exaggerate, might be cured, and the dangers which are apprehended even to Great Britain from such a Union, prevented.

As to the time, I differ so much from those Gentlemen, that if on other occasions the measure would have been *wise*, I believe it has now become *necessary*. In support of which opinion, I cannot imagine a more convincing
argu-

argument than the avowed, *the long avowed*, fear of a *Union*, among that too numerous class of men in Ireland, who have now openly professed their plan and object to be, a *Separation*. I need not again mention the declarations of *Tone*, or the confessions of *Emmet*, *M^cNevin*, and others. The proof is deeply engraven on all our memories. It has been written in characters of blood over the whole face of that desolated island. But when I know that the associates of those very men by whom the arms were forged which were intended for the destruction of the true independency, liberty, and constitution of their country, and who prepared that moral and political poison which was to corrupt and extinguish every virtuous and religious, every British principle, in the minds of their country, are full of trembling apprehensions, lest this salutary antidote should be administered in time—can I, aware as I am of the profound no less than wicked views, and the no less extraordinary than perverted talents of some of those men—can I withstand such strong confirmation of the opinion, which on other, and more general grounds, forces itself so powerfully on my mind, that we are come at last to that only alternative, *speedy Union*, or *early Separation*?

As to those other and more general grounds to which I have once before alluded, I wish I could, consistently with the orders of the House, refer to the strong and demonstrative reasoning concerning them, which some of us may have had an opportunity of hearing delivered elsewhere.³ They are among the most important branches of the subject, but are too copious and extensive for me to enter upon at present.

It

³Lord *Minto's* Speech in the House of Lords, 11th April 1799, since printed.

It is said, we ought to wait for a moment of peace and general tranquillity. If by this is understood general internal tranquillity in Ireland, I am afraid, to judge of the future by the past, the adjournment must be, as my Right Hon. Friend⁴ described it, *ad Græcas Kalendas*. But are we to wait till the general peace of Europe shall be restored? Alas! there seems at present no very near or distinct epoch discernible for that happy event. And in the mean time, our enemies, in directing their arts and their arms to their favourite object of wresting from us our sister kingdom, are to enjoy the advantages accruing to them, both from the want of a true political consent of parts in the present complex and ill-constructed machine of our imperial legislation, and from the cunning industry of their revolutionary allies in Ireland, who even now are endeavouring to obtain the co-operation of some of the men who have hitherto been their most determined foes, and the most zealous friends of Great Britain, by working on their blind and unfounded jealousy of the British Parliament, and entrapping those infatuated persons into a conduct which, if not counteracted, may enable them to accomplish the fatal end of their detestable conspiracies.

Was the Union in Scotland undertaken or carried into effect in a time of external or domestic peace? Far otherwise. But then it is said, that when it was negotiated and completed, the arms of Great Britain and her allies⁵ were triumphant. In answer to this, it need only be observed, that the treaty must be considered as
having

⁴ Mr. Windham.

⁵ The success of his Majesty's allies, since the time when this was stated, has fortunately rendered the parallel more exact in that particular than it could then have been contended to be.

having been commenced and in progress from the very beginning of the reign of Queen Anne, and when affairs abroad wore a very gloomy aspect. As to those at home, they must have cast a very careless, or a very partial eye, on that period of our history, who do not perceive, in the circumstances of a disputed succession, the yet recent concussion of the Revolution, the numerous adherents of the exiled family in both kingdoms, the jarring interests of the two countries, and the dissensions between them on account of religion and commerce, a complication of political difficulties as great, though of a different nature, perhaps much greater, than any that exist at present.

In truth, though at first sight it appears reasonable to think that times of tranquillity are best adapted to the discussion and accomplishment of great political arrangements, this speculation, on closer attention, does not seem to be warranted, either by the nature or history of mankind. On the contrary, I believe it will be found, that men and nations are too indolent for great exertions, ‘enterprises of pith and moment,’ while in the undisturbed enjoyment of quiet prosperity; and that to all their most memorable efforts of that sort, they have been stimulated by the urgency of personal or national calamity, or at least of private or public difficulties and embarrassment.

I admit that the idea of a legislative Union was long familiar in Scotland; but I deny that it now comes unawares, and by surprise, upon Ireland. I am, on the contrary, well persuaded, that such a plan for that country must have been uniformly present to the minds (I will not say always in the intention) of every minister, every statesman,

statesman, every politician, every enlightened member of Parliament, every man, in short, in that kingdom, qualified and entitled to judge of such questions, for a space of time considerably longer than what elapsed between the Union of the Crowns and that of the Parliaments of this country. I will endeavour to prove this to the satisfaction of the House, by a deduction of clear, historical facts.

To say nothing of the actual, though imperfect and illegal incorporation under the Usurper, you know, Sir, that in the reign of Charles II. by a Report of the Council of Trade in Ireland to the Lord Lieutenant and Privy Council there, dated the 25th of March 1676, that Board expressly recommended, ‘ That endeavours
 ‘ should be used for the Union of the kingdoms under
 ‘ one legislative power, proportionably, as was heretofore done in the case of Wales.’ I cite the very words of the Report, which is stated to have been drawn by Sir *William Petty*, and who, in his treatise called ‘ The Political Anatomy of Ireland,’ written, I believe, a few years before, had delivered his individual opinion to the same purpose. ‘ If,’ says he, ‘ both
 ‘ kingdoms were under one legislative power and Parliament, the numbers whereof should be proportionable
 ‘ in power and wealth of each nation, there would be
 ‘ no danger such a Parliament should do any thing to the
 ‘ prejudice of the English interest in Ireland; nor
 ‘ could the Irish ever complain of partiality, when
 ‘ they shall be freely and proportionably represented in all
 ‘ Legislatures.’⁶

In

⁶ *Petty’s Political Anatomy of Ireland*, p. 31.

In the year 1698, Mr. *Molyneux*, in that passage of his famous pamphlet called ‘The Case of Ireland,’ which was mentioned by the first authority in this House in the Committee on the Resolutions,⁷ clearly points to a representation of Ireland in a united Parliament as a most desirable arrangement for that country. His words are these :

‘ If, from these last-mentioned records, it be concluded that the Parliament of England may bind Ireland, it must also be allowed that the people of Ireland ought to have their representatives in the Parliament of England. And this I believe we should be willing enough to embrace : but this is an happiness we can hardly hope for.’⁸

And here I cannot help noticing a very singular fraud, or negative sort of forgery, committed in an edition of *Molyneux’s* work, which was printed in Dublin in the year 1783. In that edition the words ‘ and this I believe we should be willing enough to embrace : but this is a happiness we can hardly hope for ;’ were totally omitted. This circumstance I first saw pointed out in a note to a very able pamphlet lately published, entitled, ‘ Reasons for adopting an Union between Great Britain and Ireland.’ I have since been favoured by the author of that pamphlet with a copy of the castrated edition, the publisher of which could not have proved so strongly, in any other way, at once his own hostility to the measure of a Union, and the sense he justly entertained of the weight

⁷ Vide Mr. *Addington’s* Speech, p. 18.

⁸ London edition in 1770, p. 74. There is a preface to this edition, reported to have been written by the late Mr. *Flood*, with which it was republished in Dublin in 1773.

weight of such an opinion in its favour as that of *Molyneux*, the able and learned advocate of Irish independency.

But, Sir, in 1703, at the time when a similar measure was so particularly in the contemplation of the English Government with regard to Scotland, a legislative Union was in a manner sued for, and sued for in vain, by the Parliament of Ireland. This appears sufficiently from the Journals of the two Houses of that Parliament; but I have had an opportunity also of seeing the correspondence at that time of the Duke of *Ormond*, then Lord Lieutenant, and of his Chief Secretary Mr. *Southwell*, and the Lord Chancellor *Cox*, with the Government here, from which it is still more manifest that many of the leading characters in the country, the Chancellor particularly, Mr. *Brodrick* the Speaker, and I think even the Secretary himself, were very desirous of the measure, but that the Lord Lieutenant was lukewarm, and the ministry in England totally averse to it.

That Parliament met on the 21st of September, and on the 1st of October the Lords voted an address to the Queen, which concluded with these words: ‘ As we are
‘ sensible our preservation is owing to our being united
‘ to the Crown of England, so we are convinced it
‘ would tend to our farther security and happiness to
‘ have a more comprehensive and entire Union with that
‘ kingdom¹. I shall shew immediately the answer sent from England to this address.

As it appears not to have been the intention of the Administration here to listen to such a suggestion for the

T

king-

¹ Irish Lords’ Journals, vol. ii. p. 8.

kingdom of Ireland, and supplies, not general measures of policy, seeming to have been considered as the material business of the session, one is not surprised to discover in Mr. *Southwell's* first dispatches on its opening, considerable impatience *as a minister*, whatever his *private* opinion as to a Union might be, at finding the House of Commons more willing to deliberate on matters of that sort, than ready to satisfy the pecuniary exigencies of the Government. On the 25th, in a letter to Lord *Nottingham*, he says, ‘ It is a miserable fatigue we are under. We are forced to use a great deal of claret, and a great many arguments, and all little enough. There is a most strange mixture of Scotch and fanatical principles, which soures the mass. They are jealous of every thing; and were it not that my Lord Lieutenant has a great personal interest, nothing at all would be done.’ This he means in regard to the supplies, which the Lord Lieutenant endeavoured to obtain for three years, but which attempt, after every effort, he was obliged to abandon, a grant even for two having passed with difficulty.

In a short time, both houses formed themselves into Committees on the state of the nation. Two days before that of the House of Commons sat, Mr. *Southwell* writes to Lord *Nottingham*¹ his conjectures about the event, as follows: ‘ Next Monday is appointed to consider of the state of the nation; and I believe it will end in this, after considering some difficulties they lie under, to make some representation, full of temper and moderation, for gaining some relief in those points; *and many even talk of a Union.*’

When

When the Committee took place, it appears that the wish for that measure was still more general than he had foreseen.

‘ This day,’ says he, in a letter written at night to the same Nobleman¹, ‘ the House of Commons had appointed to go into the state of the nation; and after some hours sitting, and considering the many misfortunes the country lay under, in point of trade and other circumstances, *all the speakers concluded, that they did, in the most earnest manner, desire a Union with England*, and they have appointed Friday next to consider that matter, and how to represent the same to the Lord Lieutenant, to lay it before her Majesty, that her Majesty may interpose with the Parliament of England in that affair. I must needs own, that the great temper and good disposition of the debate surprised most people; and those things which seemed to be the loudest grievances were touched with all the true sense, but at the same time with the true disposition, as if they desired nothing more, which I hope will incline the next session², by her Majesty’s mediation, to cultivate this good disposition.’

It is from the tenour of this letter, and some others in the same spirit, that I infer both that the sober wish and opinion of the leading men was strongly in favour of a Union, and that Mr. *Southwell* himself was inclined to it.

The

¹ Oct. 4.

² *i. e.* Of the *English* Parliament, which met in the beginning of the following month, Nov. 1703.

The House sat in the Committee on several different days; and it appears³ that the Speaker, Mr. *Brodrick*, took an active part in framing certain resolutions, which were reported by Mr. *Molesworth*, the Chairman, on the 11th; and the last of which was, ‘ that her Majesty be
 ‘ most humbly moved, that through her princely goodness, and wisdom, and favourable interposition, her
 ‘ subjects of this kingdom may be relieved from the
 ‘ calamities they now lie under, by a full enjoyment of
 ‘ their constitution, *or a more firm and strict Union with*
 ‘ *England*’.

These resolutions were afterwards formed into a Representation addressed to the Queen, which concluded nearly to the same effect. The Representation was voted on the 20th of October.

On the 25th the House of Lords resolved, ‘ Upon due
 ‘ consideration of the present constitution of this kingdom, that such an humble representation be made to
 ‘ the Queen, of the state and condition thereof, as may
 ‘ best incline her Majesty, by such proper means as to
 ‘ her Majesty shall seem fit, for promoting such an
 ‘ Union with England as may qualify the states of this
 ‘ kingdom to be represented in the Parliament there’.

I do not find that any farther step was taken by that House in consequence of this resolution. The Queen’s answer to their address was couched in obliging terms, but
 took

³ Mr. *Southwell*’s Letter to Lord *Nottingham*, 9th Oct. 1703.

⁴ Journals of the Irish House of Commons, vol. iii. p. 45.

⁵ Journals of the Irish House of Lords, vol. ii. p. 29.

took no notice whatever of the suggestion relative to a Union⁶.

That to the Representation of the Commons was in less gracious language: ‘ Her Majesty having considered
‘ of the Representation made by the House of Commons
‘ in Ireland, has commanded this answer to be returned:
‘ That the first part seems to relate to matters past in
‘ Parliament, and the other part’ (in which a Union was mentioned) ‘ consisting only of things in general,
‘ her Majesty can give no particular answer at present,
‘ but will take them into her consideration.’

It was not received till the 11th of February⁷, at an interval of near four months from the delivery of the Representation to the Lord Lieutenant⁸.

It is difficult to conceive what good reasons could have been stated by the Administration of England at that time for rejecting, in so harsh and disdainful a manner, advances towards a measure which, as the Irish Commons justly observed in their Representation, would unquestionably have been to the advantage of that kingdom. Whatever *ratio justificativa* they might have been able to plead, it is probable the *ratio suaseria* was, that the business was chiefly promoted in Ireland by the party they supposed hostile to themselves. To shew how little difficulty the carrying of it into execution was likely to have encountered there, in addition to what I have already stated, I will read the concluding paragraph of a letter

⁶ It was dated Windsor, 12th Oct. 1703, and communicated to the Lords in Ireland on the 19th of that month. Journals of the Irish House of Lords, vol. ii. p. 24.

⁷ Journals of the Irish House of Commons, vol. iii. p. 168.

⁸ Oct. 22. Ibid. p. 70. 74.

letter from Sir *Richard Cox*, the Chancellor, to Lord *Nottingham*, dated Feb. 13, 1703-4:

‘ There is no remedy so proper for both kingdoms as
 ‘ some sort of Union, which would conduce to enrich and
 ‘ strengthen England, and establish the English interest
 ‘ here, and make it prosper; for in that case all the British
 ‘ would be good Englishmen; and *since we do not capitulate*,
 ‘ *and you may be your own carvers*, it seems worthy
 your serious thoughts to promote so good a work.’

And let not Gentlemen suppose that the Union was then considered merely as a refuge from the abject condition of a subordinate Legislature. Whatever topics the warmth of opposition may have introduced into the Representation of the Irish Commons, the transactions of both Houses during that session completely prove how fully they acted as the uncontrolled branches of a Parliament perfectly *sui juris*. The Commons with difficulty granted supplies for two years, instead of for three as had been demanded; and this, after calculating the establishment on the lowest scale, and debiting the Treasury with the outstanding arrears of revenue, contrary to former practice. The other House, without regard to any offence which might be taken in England, by a solemn resolution asserted their supreme and exclusive right of appeal, and actually exercised it by issuing an order under which the Earl of *Meath* was put in possession of an estate, directly in the teeth of a decree of the House of Lords in England⁹.

The

⁹ Journals of the Irish House of Lords, vol. ii. p. 24. 28. 30. 34, 35, 36. 41, 42. 44. 52, 53. 62.

The spirit of that House in the business of their judicature may be farther judged of from a paragraph in the letter I have already quoted of Sir *Richard Cox*, to Lord *Nottingham*: ‘ Your Lordship may be pleased to
 ‘ remember, that from the beginning, and particularly
 ‘ in the closet before my Lord Treasurer, I expressed
 ‘ more apprehension from the debates of the Lords than
 ‘ of the Commons; for I knew the former would think
 ‘ themselves bound in honour to vindicate a jurisdiction
 ‘ they claim as inseparably inherent to a House of
 ‘ Lords, and which they might conceive the Lords in
 ‘ England could not oppose without shaking their own
 ‘ foundations.’

About the time when these proceedings were going on in the Parliament, the subject of a Union between Ireland] and this country appears by many publications to have been a very general topic of discussion out of doors.

Sir *Thomas Brewster*, who had been a member of the Irish House of Commons, published, in the year 1702, a pamphlet, entitled, ‘ *New Essays on Trade*,’ in which there is a long chapter on the subject. I will not trouble the House with all his reasoning upon it, though it is clearly that of an intelligent and sensible man, but I beg leave to read the following short passage:

‘ By this measure future rebellions would be pre-
 ‘ vented, which that kingdom was never long free from.
 ‘ Ireland would be then England, and the nation become
 ‘ more formidable abroad and safer at home—Ireland
 ‘ making, as it were, one continent with this island,
 ‘ which it would become in effect, and more usefully
 ‘ than if it were so in reality.’

In a book printed in the same year, entitled, *Miscellanea Aulica*, there is a short paper with this superscription, ‘ A Proposal of several Officers, and other Gentlemen of English Extraction in Ireland, for a Union of that Kingdom with England.’ There is no date to it; but it must have been originally drawn up either in the reign of Charles II. or of King William, as appears by this introductory paragraph:

‘ His Majesty’s good subjects in Ireland, upon the hearing of a proposal made not long since for the uniting England and Scotland’ (there was, I believe, no such proposal in James the Second’s time,) ‘ with all obedience and submission humbly conceive it a means conducive thereto, if the like Union of England and Ireland, under *one legislative power assembled in one Parliament*, might be resettled *de jure*, in something like the manner it was formerly *de facto*, to the facilitating his Majesty’s gracious government of both kingdoms, dissolving of many intricate difficulties, taking away much of the root of difference and discord between the now many parties in his Majesty’s said kingdoms, and strengthening his hands against all opposition, both at home and abroad.’

It seems pretty clear, from the title and style of this proposal, that it was designed to be laid before Government, and was the act of some known and considerable class of persons; so that it most probably was a matter of general notoriety.

I will mention one other publication of that time, which expressly purports to have been submitted to the consideration of Queen Anne and her Parliament. The title

title, ‘ An Essay upon an Union of Ireland with England, most humbly offered to the Consideration of the Queen’s most excellent Majesty and both Houses of Parliament.’ The date, in the copy I have seen, is ‘ Dublin, reprinted, 1704.’

This author states his opinion, that while Ireland continues a distinct kingdom, the only precautions England can take to prevent any danger that may arise to it from that country, are, 1st, to entrust the Government there entirely in the hands of Englishmen; or, 2dly, to check the growth of that kingdom in point of trade and wealth, so that it may not be able to attempt any thing against the constitution of England. He afterwards enters into a variety of arguments to shew the equal injustice and impolicy of either of those methods, and then comes to his proposal of a Union, which he supports in a manner very clear and forcible, on considerations respecting the interests and relative situation of the two kingdoms, proving himself (whoever he was) to have been a person of more than ordinary information and abilities.

Thus, Sir, I think I have shewn that this idea, now said to be so novel to Ireland, must have been in the general contemplation of all thinking people in that country from the days of *Cromwell* to the period of the Union of England and Scotland.

Upon that event the hopes of those true patriots in Ireland, as I must consider them, who wished for the blessing of a like Union to their own country, seem to have revived, while the English Ministers of that day continued to feel the same disinclination to it, which had

been manifested by those in power at the beginning of the reign.

In the speech of the Earl of *Pembroke*, then Lord Lieutenant, at the opening of the session on the 7th of July 1707, so memorable and important an occurrence as the Union with Scotland, was not even mentioned.¹ But the Commons that very day resolved on an address of congratulation to her Majesty, ‘on the accomplishment of the great work of uniting her Majesty’s kingdoms of England and Scotland.’² Mr. *Brodrick* was chairman of the committee who prepared it, and it is drawn in such warm language of admiration as clearly evinces how great an impression the subject had made: ‘We crave leave to lay hold of the earliest opportunity humbly to address your Majesty with our most hearty and sincere congratulations, for the inward joy and satisfaction you are blessed with, and the glory you have acquired by accomplishing the Union of your Majesty’s kingdoms of England and Scotland. This great and glorious work, which your ancestors, with their utmost endeavours, laboured to accomplish, lay above the reach and wisdom of former times, and seems to have been reserved by Heaven for your Majesty’s reign, as one great reward of an exemplary piety and heroic virtue, signally demonstrated in what you have resolutely undertaken, and successfully carried on, to procure the general happiness, and secure the liberty of Europe. The difficulty of the attempt required the greatest genius to surmount it; and we cannot but highly honour and admire the wisdom of those councils that have by it given a further security

¹ Journals of the Irish Lords, vol. ii. p. 153. Of the House of Commons, vol. iii. p. 364.

² Journals of Irish Commons, vol. iii. p. 365.

‘ security to the peace and safety of your Majesty’s government, the Protestant succession, and the church as by law established in England and Ireland. *May God put it in your royal heart to add greater strength and lustre to your crown, by a still more comprehensive Union.*’³

The Lords expressed themselves to the same effect, though not quite in such direct terms: ‘ We congratulate the glorious success of your Majesty’s endeavours for securing, by your arms abroad, the liberties of Europe, and the welfare of your subjects at home, by uniting Great Britain into one body under the same Protestant succession to the throne of all your dominions. We are sensible how effectual a means that will prove to prevent the attempts of Papists from disturbing the quiet of your Majesty’s empire, and particularly of this kingdom, that has been so often endangered by them. *May your Majesty go on and extend your favour to all your subjects till none are excluded from so great a blessing, but such as by their own forwardness or disaffection to the public good bar themselves from the general advantages of your Majesty’s reign.*’⁴

The Queen’s answer to the Commons was in these very general and evasive terms: ‘ The Commons may be assured, that nothing shall be wanting on her part to make the Union of all her subjects as extensive as is possible.’⁵ And although in their new address of thanks for this answer they seem to have been desirous to give it an interpretation applicable to the measure they had in contemplation, declaring that ‘ The assurance
her

³ Journals of the Irish Commons, vol. iii. p. 338.

⁴ 15th July 1707, Journals of Irish Lords, vol. ii. p. 161.

⁵ 30th July 1707, Journals of Irish Commons, vol. iii. p. 420.

‘ her Majesty had been pleased to give them, had inspired
 ‘ them with hopes of *an addition* to the many blessings they
 ‘ enjoyed under her most auspicious reign ;” ‘ yet no real
 encouragement being given to their overtures on the sub-
 ject, the matter was prosecuted no farther. The whole of
 the answer to the address of the Lords was in these formal,
 cold, and disheartening words : ‘ Her Majesty returns
 ‘ their Lordships her hearty thanks for their address, and
 ‘ is very sensible of their zeal for hers and the public
 ‘ service. Her Majesty is also very well pleased with
 ‘ the satisfaction their Lordships express in her endea-
 ‘ vours to unite all her subjects.’ ⁷

The English Government and the Irish Parliament had one very natural sentiment in common, the apprehension of danger from the great number of Catholics in Ireland, who continued attached to a dethroned monarch of the same religion with themselves. But the Parliament seems to have looked to a legislative Union as the surest protection against this danger. The Ministers in England preferred the establishment of a system of severe penalties and disqualifications against Papists, restrictive of the rights, as well civil as political, which, till then, they had enjoyed in that country equally with their Protestant fellow-subjects. And the attempt to engage the Queen in the measure they had recommended having failed, the Parliament, seeing no third course, thought themselves compelled to co-operate with the Crown in adopting the other expedient. It has, accordingly, been truly remarked by a great authority in the sister kingdom, ‘ That it was not till the proposition to unite the Le-
 ‘ gislatures

⁶ 31st July 1707, Journals of Irish Commons, vol. iii. p. 421.

⁷ Journals of the Irish House of Lords, 4th August 1707, vol. ii. p. 180.

‘ gillatures of the two countries had proved abortive, that
 ‘ the great code of the popery laws of Ireland was
 ‘ enacted.’⁸

I do not find the matter of Union to have been afterwards revived in the Irish Parliament, but it still continued to be a very general and frequent subject of public discussion in both kingdoms.

In *Cato’s Letters*, a work, I believe, of universal circulation about the middle of the ensuing reign, Mr. *Trenchard*, who was peculiarly versed in the concerns of Ireland, recommended it in the following terms, which conclude one of the letters in that collection written by him, and entitled, ‘ On Plantations and Colonies :’
 ‘ Ireland is too powerful to be treated only as a colony.
 ‘ *If we design to continue them friends*, the best way to do it
 ‘ is to imitate the example of merchants and shopkeepers;
 ‘ that is, when their apprentices are acquainted with
 ‘ their trade, and out of their time, to take them into
 ‘ partnership rather than let them *set up for themselves*
 ‘ in the neighbourhood.’⁹

It is very clear that neither he nor any of the earlier writers I have quoted, ever imagined there could be any difficulty or objection raised on the part of Ireland.

In the reign of George the II^d, about the year 1735, the excellent *Berkeley*, a most impartial and enlightened patriot, published a book on the interests of Ireland, called ‘ *The Querist*,’ from many passages in which he
 appears

⁸ Lord *Fitzgibbon’s* Speech in the Irish House of Lords, 13th March 1793, Irish edition, p. 16.

⁹ *Cato’s Letters*, 3d edition, vol. iv. Letter I. p. 12.

appears to have had the expediency of a Union, for the advantage both of his native country and this, strongly impressed on his mind. In the 90th query particularly, he thus expresses himself : ‘ *Qu.* Whether if it be not the true interest of both nations to become *one people*, and whether either be sufficiently apprised of this ?’

Dean *Tucker*’s proposal for ‘ A Union with Ireland,’ was first printed, I believe, in the year 1751, in his ‘ Essay on Trade ;’¹ a work as generally read and studied in Ireland as Great Britain.

In the year following (1752) a tract appeared under the title of ‘ A Proposal for uniting the Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland.’ which was generally understood to be the production of a respectable Nobleman of the sister kingdom, to whom I have before alluded, the late Marquis of *Downshire* ; and if I am not much misinformed, this measure now under consideration, *viz.* a legislative incorporation, which it was the object of that publication to recommend, was, during the whole of his life, a favourite object with that experienced statesman, a frequent subject of his conversation and discussion in both kingdoms, and strongly recommended by him at different times to the different persons successively at the head of Government.

Sir, I trust the selection I have made, which, though a small part of what might have been stated, may, I fear, have appeared tedious to the House, has fully proved my assertion, that this subject has not come on the sudden, and by surprise, on the people and Parliament of Ireland.

Indeed

¹ Proposal 3d and 4th.

Indeed Mr. *Burke* (whose name I cannot pronounce without reverence and affection) tells us, in his Letter to Sir *Hercules Langrishe*, ‘ that he had heard a discussion concerning an Union amongst all sorts of men ever since he remembered any thing.’²

I wish I could have added that great man to the list of those, both in Ireland and here, who have been decided advocates for the measure ; but lest he should be supposed to have been decidedly of a contrary opinion, I will subjoin the candid language in which he goes on in the same passage to express himself concerning it :

‘ For my own part,’ says he, ‘ I have never been able to bring my mind to any thing clear and decisive on the subject ; there cannot be a more arduous question. As far as I can form an opinion, it would not be for the mutual advantage of both kingdoms ; but persons more able than I am think otherwise. But whatever the merits of this Union may be, to make it a menace it must be shewn to be an evil, and an evil more particularly to those who are threatened with it, than to those who throw it out as a terror. I really do not see how this threat can operate, or that the Catholics are more likely to be losers than the Churchmen.’³

It cannot have escaped the attention of the House, that none of those of whom I have made mention, neither Sir *William Petty*, the Irish Council of Trade, the two Houses of that Parliament in 1703 and 1707, nor Mr. *Trenchard*, Bishop *Berkeley*, Dean *Tucker*, Lord *Downshire*, or Mr. *Burke*, ever seem to have entertained a
suspicion

² Second edition, p. 75.

³ Ibid.

suspicion of that new discovery—the incompetency of the Irish Parliament.

What has been stated to shew the long and continued attention which must have been given to the subject in Ireland, goes a great way also to prove, that there must always have been a great number of persons there, in that sphere of life in which alone men are to be found in any country capable of understanding and judging of such matters, who were strongly of opinion, that a legislative Union would be of the utmost benefit to theirs.

It has, however, been very confidently averred, that the Irish in general have always been averse to a Union; insomuch that whenever it has been an object there to render a new Lord Lieutenant unpopular, it has been customary to give out as a watchword, that he had been sent over for the purpose of effecting that measure. I know, Sir, that the art of running down a Lord Lieutenant in former times has been carried to a great degree of perfection in that kingdom, and perhaps it may not yet have fallen into absolute disuse. But is it thought that such a '*politic trick*' (as *De Foe* expresses himself on a similar subject) furnishes a very serious proof of the disinclination of the majority of that nation to the measure? Will those who reason in this way deny, that there have been times, and those not very remote, when a cry that the object of a Chief Governor's mission was what is called '*Catholic emancipation*,' would have been no ineffectual means of exciting the mob of Dublin against him, perhaps of embarrassing or overturning his government? Friends as they are to the admission of the Catholics to an equal participation of political rights, will they consent to a similar argument being built against that favourite

favourite object of theirs on such a circumstance? The truth is, catchwords and quaint abstractions have a wonderful effect sometimes on that multitude; ‘ Protestant ascendancy,’ and ‘ Catholic emancipation,’ have each had their day,—both, I believe, coined in the same mint. ‘ Parliamentary incompetency’ may, perhaps, be the favourite at present; but that phrase has too little singularity of diction, and is too plain, as well as too obviously false in its meaning, to have a very long reign.

In fact, however, when artful people have chosen to raise an alarm, or excite prejudices in Ireland against a Union, they have not satisfied themselves with a vague and general description of it; they have accompanied that term with explanations naturally and justly tending to render the measure offensive and obnoxious to the nation. Do we find, when the Council of Trade and the Parliament, when *Molyneux*, and *Berkeley*, and Lord *Hillborough* recommended it, that they lost the good-will of their country? But when, as in 1759, on an occasion, an account of which has been quoted from the Annual Register of that year,³ the Union supposed to be in contemplation, has been represented as a measure intended to subject the Irish nation ‘ *to the same taxes with England* ;’ when it has been represented, to use the language imputed to a learned Gentleman formerly a member of that Parliament, ‘ that a Union would be *the participation of British taxes without British trade*, and render the kingdom of Ireland a wretched colony, governed by a few excisemen ;’⁴—one does not wonder that with such comments, the indignation of the populace

x

should

³ Vol. ii. p. 129.

⁴ Irish Parliamentary Debates, vol. xii. p. 177, 178.

should have been raised against it; though every body must disapprove of the disorderly violence by which they were prompted, in 1759, to break into the House of Lords, and commit that sort of gross and indecent insult towards the Throne which has been mentioned, and which another Dublin mob, on a more recent and less excusable occasion, is said to have practised towards the Chair of the House of Commons.

As to the supposition of a universality of sentiment at present manifested in Ireland against the Union, I must not expect that Gentlemen on the other side will pay the attention I think they deserve to my reasons for dissenting from it, especially as it was two months ago^s affirmed in this place, that there were then authentic documents arrived to prove the fact. According to my information, however, at that time only certain meetings in Dublin and its neighbourhood, and in a few of the counties in Leinster, had declared any such opinion; Cork had addressed his Majesty in favour of a Union, and if I have not been greatly deceived, pretty active endeavours had been used, but, up to that time at least, in vain, to procure addresses and resolutions against it from various respectable counties in the north, the west, and the south. Since then, indeed, new addressers and resolvers have appeared, but we have also seen various counter-resolutions. Those of the Grand Juries of the first city in magnitude and opulence next to Dublin, and of the first county, that of Cork, are particularly to be distinguished.

Sir, I should be one of the last to treat with neglect the real sense of the nation on this or any subject;

ject; but which on this, as it shall be expressed by the suffrages of its representatives, must ultimately decide the question; or to say, that even through such irregular and uncertain organs as county or corporation meetings, the voice of the people is not worthy of the most serious attention. Yet when I look back on the history of this country for the last century and a half, and on that of France for the last *decade* of years, as I suppose I ought to call it; when I call to mind the addresses to *Richard Cromwell* on his succession to the Protectorate, those in Scotland against the Union of 1707, and those in France calumniating the virtuous and saint-like *Lewis XVI.* as a tyrant, and extolling the bloody *Robespierre* and his associates as the saviours of their country; I must be pardoned if I cannot consider such acts and instruments, however numerous, and whatever respectable names may be found among the subscriptions to them, as very certain tests of national opinion. Much less as unchangeable tests; for, satisfied as I am of the importance and even necessity of this measure for the safety of Ireland, I will not think so ill of one of the most intelligent as well as most liberal-minded nations that exists, though withal, at times, somewhat hasty and irritable, as not to believe, when the arts that have been employed to excite their jealousy and alarm their honourable pride shall have been detected, and the illusions of that sophistry, which has very unfortunately been taken for sound argument by a few able men among them, (for what abilities are proof against prejudice and prepossession?) and has been dressed up with all the skill and talents they possess, to be circulated among the people at large, shall have vanished in the hour of sober judgment and reflection; that the great majority of the present opponents will change their sentiments, and feel the truth of the old adage, that second thoughts,

thoughts, in matters of such moment, are generally the best.

This the Scotch nation have fully experienced by the blessings they have derived from the Union of 1707, at first so strongly opposed by so many people of every class and description in the country. That this was the case is as clear, I believe, as any historical fact whatever; and therefore it has seemed very strange to me to hear the resistance made in Scotland at that time, treated by some Gentlemen as having been slight and insignificant in comparison to the opposition now existing in Ireland to the Union between that country and this; and the measure represented in truth to have been the general wish and desire of the whole nation. Indeed, Sir, mistaken notions of the dignity and advantage of a separate and independent Legislature, exclusively their own, having existed among the Scotch, from the first junction of the two Crowns, in at least as exalted a degree as that to which they are now carried in Ireland, I do not understand upon what evidence it is alledged that, even at that early period, that nation was anxious for a complete *legislative incorporation* with their southern neighbours. James I. who had become the common Sovereign of both, might desire it. He was certainly desirous of a stricter Union than the mere descent of the English monarchy upon him had produced. And a *legislative Union* was undoubtedly in the contemplation of some of the great statesmen, with whom he seems chiefly to have consulted on the subject, particularly Sir Francis Bacon. But, from a consideration of the articles agreed to in Scotland on that occasion, it will be found, that the actual treaty which became the subject of negotiation was only of a federal and commercial kind, and intended to estab-

lish

blish an equal communication of civil and personal rights ; but not to incorporate the Parliaments : and the Parliament of that country expressly declared, during the progress of the business, ‘ *that the kingdom should remain an absolute and free monarchy.*’⁶

When, after the Restoration, in 1670, the Commissioners for both kingdoms came to treat for an efficient incorporation of the two Legislatures, though the Scotch shewed themselves perfectly well inclined to the general proposition, yet, by insisting on terms to which they must have been sure England could never agree, namely, that the whole body of the Scotch Parliament, the full number of their Peers and Commoners, should be joined to those of England ;⁷ they seem to me to have proved very clearly that they were not disposed to negotiate upon any practicable or admissible conditions. Accordingly, at that time, the affair went off in truth on the part of Scotland.

But to come to the treaty which was carried into effect. That the great majority of the truly wise and sober men of the country, the real patriots and genuine statesmen, and I would add too, the men of the truest and most elevated and enlightened ambition, earnestly wished for it, and were vigilant in seizing every occasion and circumstance which could tend to its completion, I most readily allow. But that the factious, the seditious, and the rebellious, that many not obnoxious to such charges, but who had either confined their views to that limited sphere of action, or, like the celebrated *Fletcher*, possessing great and cultivated minds, had heated their

⁶ *Spottiswoode*, p. 505.

⁷ 1st November 1670. *De Foe*, p. 61.

their imaginations with notions of government incompatible with the ancient institutions of their country, or any form which an incorporation of the two existing constitutions could assume, but which, from the peculiarly disordered state of Scotland at the time—chimerical as they were—they vainly hoped they might see realized; that all those and various other classes of men, forming, perhaps, a majority of the whole, reckoning by tale instead of weight, by numbers instead of property, were the declared and active enemies of the Union, is, I believe, as certain, as it is, that, by virtue of the manly and steady disregard with which the Administration of that day treated their hostility and violence, one of the most important and fortunate political transactions recorded in the annals of the world, was brought to a happy conclusion. I would recommend to any man who really has doubts on this point, the re-perusal and comparison of the contemporary authors who have written on the subject, particularly the two most remarkable among them, *De Foe* the able historian and advocate, and *Lockhart* the defamer and libeller, of the Union.

Permit me to read a passage from another writer of the time, Bishop *Burnet*, as the matter of it, I think, gives us strong encouragement to cherish the most favourable prospect of the issue of the present still more important measure.

‘ The Union,’ says he, ‘ of the two kingdoms was a work of which many had despaired, in which number I was one; and those who entertained better hopes, thought it must have run out into a long negotiation for several years; but, beyond all men’s expectation, it was begun and finished within the compass of one.
‘ The

‘ The body of the people shewed so much fullness, that
 ‘ probably, had any person of authority once kindled the
 ‘ flame, they seemed of such combustible matter, that
 ‘ the Union might have cast that nation into great con-
 ‘ vulsions. The Duke of *Queensberry* despaired of succeed-
 ‘ ing, and one about him wrote to the Lord Treasurer
 ‘ respecting the ill-temper the nation was *generally* in,
 ‘ and moving for an adjournment, that so, with the help
 ‘ of time and good management, those difficulties, which
 ‘ seemed then insuperable, might be conquered.’⁸ He
 adds, ‘ The Lord Treasurer told me his answer was—
 ‘ that a delay was, upon the matter, laying the whole
 ‘ design aside.’⁹

Nay, Sir, in the House of Lords, when the treaty
 came to be debated there, Lord *Haversham* appears ex-
 pressly to have stated, and without being contradicted by
 any body, ‘ That though the articles of Union were ra-
 ‘ tified by the Scotch Parliament, yet the bulk and body
 ‘ of that nation seemed to be against it. Have not,’ he
 said, ‘ the murmurs of the people there been so loud as
 ‘ to fill the whole nation, and so bold too as to reach even
 ‘ to the doors of the Parliament? Has not the Parlia-
 ‘ ment itself thought fit to suspend their beloved clause
 ‘ in their act of security, for arming their people, during
 ‘ the session? Nay, has not the Government, by advice
 ‘ of Parliament, issued a proclamation, pardoning all
 ‘ slaughter, bloodshed, maiming, &c. that is committed
 ‘ upon any who are found in any tumults there? I do not
 ‘ mention this to find fault with any thing done in Scot-
 ‘ land, but only to shew to your Lordships, that where
 ‘ such an unusual proclamation as this is set out by the
 ‘ advice

⁸ *Burnet's History of his own Times*, vol. ii. p. 462.

⁹ *Ibid.*

‘ advice of Parliament, and cannot stay for the forms of
 ‘ a law ; when we know that, on extraordinary occasions,
 ‘ a bill may be read three times in a day ; sure, my Lords,
 ‘ it shews a very great ferment, that requires so very
 ‘ speedy an application.’¹

To an infinity of evidence of this contemporaneous sort, might be added the result of that evidence as it has been collected by every historian who has written on the subject in later times, but I will only mention a short sentence or two from one who, in declaring his opinion of the advantages the Union has produced to both countries, but especially to Scotland, expresses himself in the following strong and glowing language : ‘ The Union
 ‘ of the two kingdoms, into which the English entered
 ‘ with so much facility, and the *Scotch with so much reluctance*, was yet of infinitely higher advantage to the
 ‘ latter than the former. An inseparable connexion was
 ‘ thereby formed between them, by which Scotland was
 ‘ to experience and augment the happiness, the glory, and
 ‘ the stability of England. They were to be constant
 ‘ companions in prosperity and misfortune ; and if England is ever to perish like Carthage, Sparta, and Rome,
 ‘ its sister nation will prolong the struggle, hold the fortunes of the victor in suspense, and exert, in extinction
 ‘ and death, that elevation of character, and that disdain
 ‘ of a master, which distinguish and ennoble the revolutions of her history.’²

We have been told that a majority of each of the three classes who composed the Parliament of Scotland voted for the Union. They did so ; but it is remarkable, if you take

¹ Continuation of Rapin, vol. xvi. p. 365.

² Stuart's History of Scotland, vol. ii. p. 56.

take each of those three classes, which were called Estates, separately, and suppose the concurrence of a majority of each necessary, which perhaps it was,³ that in each of the two Estates of commoners that majority was but four, the rest of the total majority of thirty-three being composed of twenty-five noblemen. On the other hand, if you suppose an absolute majority *per capita* to have been all that was requisite, then that total majority fell short by four of the aggregate number of the votes in favour of Union on the divisions in the two Irish Houses taken together, on the 22d of January last, the first day the matter was agitated there.⁴

It has been stated in this place, in the very face of the proof I have mentioned, and the known facts to which I have referred, that the number of addressees and addressers in Scotland against the measure was comparatively small, and the symptoms of active opposition out of the Parliament scarcely any. How must the diligent and accurate spirit of investigation, which belongs to those who made that assertion, have deserted them in their inquiries on this occasion? Otherwise, could they have overlooked the vast number of those addressees, amounting to between 80 and 90⁵ (while those against the commercial propositions in 1785, which were thought so numerous and proved so formidable, were in all but 62,⁶) and the extensive and diversified description of the parties subscribing; barons, heritors, and freeholders of, I believe,

every

³ Supra, p. 117.

⁴ In the House of Lords, on the division on Lord Bellamont's Amendment, the majority for the Union was 36, the numbers being 52 to 16.

⁵ According to *De Foe* (p. 329 to 457), just 85.

⁶ Parliamentary Register, vol. xviii. p. 212.

every county but one in that kingdom, burgesses of almost every borough, synods, presbyteries, and parishes, in every district of the country ? In short, they were so numerous, and so various, that it was not without colour, that in a famous protest, prepared by the opposition of that day, it was asserted, ‘ That the subjects of this nation of all ranks and qualities have generally shewn an utter aversion to any such Union as is contained in the articles now lying before the House.’⁷

Then, Sir, as to the activity of the opposition without doors, have the accounts, contained in the authors I have quoted, in *Burnet*, *Lockhart*, and *De Foe*, entirely escaped those gentlemen ; of the riots at Edinburgh, the insurrection at Glasgow, the army of 7000 men in the West, ready and on the wing to advance to the Capital and disperse the Parliament ?⁸ Thank God, we have seen nothing of any attempt towards such treasonable methods of controlling the deliberations of the Irish Legislature on this occasion.

Is it worth while to answer the observation, that the addressees were in general (they were not all so) against *the terms of the Union contained in the articles* ? Surely, it cannot be imagined, or at least till lately it could not have been imagined, that many persons should have been found to join in objecting to entertain or deliberate upon a mere general proposition of Union undefined by any specific terms whatever. But it is well known that the framers and instigators of those addressees objected principally

⁷ *Lockhart*, p. 298.

⁸ *Ibid.* p. 283.

pally to that *essential part* of the articles, the incorporation of the Legislatures.

It is therefore clear that a much stronger prejudice, a much more violent spirit, discovered themselves against the Scotch Union than it has been possible to excite in Ireland on the present occasion. The same prejudice certainly continued for a few years afterwards, fomented by the partisans of the exiled family, on the one hand, and all who wished to thwart the existing administration, on the other ; and this prejudice, no doubt, contributed very much to increase the temporary infatuation of the Scotch Lords in 1713, who, on the occasion of the malt-tax I mentioned some time ago, moved for the dissolution of the Union.

But the good sense of that nation, and their early feeling of the benefits daily accruing to them from the measure, soon appear to have made converts, even of the still numerous class of adherents to James. A most striking fact in proof of this was mentioned in a former debate by my Right Honourable Friend the Secretary of State. He did not think it necessary to state authorities for a circumstance so well known to many persons conversant in the events of those times ; but from his not having done so, occasion was taken to suggest a doubt concerning it. *

A few words will take away every pretext for any such doubt. The fact stated was, that the Pretender in 1715, two years only after the affair of the malt, knowing the resistance to the Union which had been so very general throughout Scotland at the time it was in agitation, had,
in

in the manifesto he was about to issue, declared his purpose to be that it should be dissolved, but that upon better inquiry he discovered that the country had already become so sensible of its beneficial consequences, that such a declaration would injure his cause, and that he had therefore altered his design, and omitted the intended clause in his proclamation.

Now, Sir, this fact, besides other proof, is completely established by an extract lately printed in Dr. *Somerville's* History of Queen Anne from the manuscript Memorials of Sir *John Clerk*, a gentleman of character and eminence in the beginning of the century, member of the last Parliament of Scotland, and who was much in the confidence of the principal persons concerned in Scotch affairs at the time of the Union and for many years afterwards. Those Memorials were written fresh as the events occurred, for the use and instruction of his own family. The words of the manuscript are these: ‘ The Scots were so sensible
‘ of the benefit of the Union, that at the time of the
‘ rebellion, in 1715, the Pretender was obliged to alter
‘ that part of his proclamation which promised to repeal
‘ the Union, and to express his determination to leave it
‘ to the decision of Parliament.’¹

The apprehensions of inconvenience to Great Britain which I have heard stated, have been, 1st, removal of capital; 2d, the increased numbers in the House of Commons; 3d, some supposed incongruity between the national habits and character of the people of Ireland and of those of this country, which may occasion an injurious change in the character, modes, and principles of deliberation.

¹ *Somerville's* History of Queen Anne, p. 228. Note 4.

deliberation and decision of our Legislature. To these I may add an objection which is of a general nature, and not applicable more to the case of the one country than to that of the other ; viz. 4th, that a Union on the basis of the Resolutions now before us will be imperfect.

1. As to the removal of capital, I will only say a single word or two, in addition to what I have already very shortly observed on that subject ;² namely, that if there is, in the overflowing capital of this country, a great deal beyond what is engaged in its commerce and agriculture, that surplus cannot be more advantageously laid out for Great Britain than by the employment of it in what will then make a part of one and the same kingdom. We are indeed told, ‘ that the capital of England is so fully employed, that there is none to spare.’³ But I know not how that opinion is to be reconciled to the eagerness with which, to this moment, we see men ready to engage large sums in every new speculation affording a reasonable prospect of security for their principal, though with a very moderate interest upon it—many people of late, to a great extent of adventure, running the hazard of failure altogether, and yet agreeing to confine their returns, whatever may be the success of the undertaking, within the narrowest limits of what is usually considered as fair mercantile profit, many to 10,⁴ some even to 5, per cent. How
is

² Supra, p. 31, 32.

³ Mr. Fossler's Speech, p. 86.

⁴ Ten per cent. is the dividend to which, I believe, Parliament has of late confined most of those enterprises to which its sanction has been given.

is it to be reconciled to the daily investments of large sums in the stocks, while the dividends amount to little more than 5 per cent. ? ⁵ or to the known fact, that an immense proportion of the trade of many parts of the continent, I fear no inconsiderable share of that of the enemy, is carried on with British capital ; not to mention what, even under the present forbidding circumstances, is engaged in the commerce of Ireland itself ? ⁶

2. Some Gentlemen dread the accession of a hundred members (I speak, as they did, hypothetically) to the British Parliament. This, it is thought, may change the cast and quality of this House as a public assembly, and render it too popular and tumultuous.

Sir, I will not deny that I have felt some difficulty on this part of the subject. Indeed I should be ashamed to dissemble any objection which may have weighed with me, in a case where I look upon it as a duty,—it is so, undoubtedly, in all deliberations here,—but in a peculiar degree as a duty, to examine the question, not as an advocate, and for defence, but, as far as I am capable, as a judge who is, in his share and proportion, to decide upon it.

But, Sir, I have considered, on the other hand, that this, at most, is but a conjectural disadvantage, and of a very secondary sort at all events, when balanced against the

⁵ They now fall short of it.

⁶ I believe the commerce of Ireland has always been carried on in a very considerable proportion with England capital. Sir *William Petty*, in the last century, said, ‘ The stock which drives the foreign trade of Ireland doth near half of it belong to those who live out of Ireland.’ *Political Anatomy of Ireland*, p. 90.

the calamity of separation, which I think I see is already put into the opposite scale.

I have also recollected, that by the original principle of our constitution, the Crown, and of course the English Parliament, could increase, without any fixed limitation, the number of representative members; that in the reigns of Henry the Eighth and his descendants, this prerogative was exercised to a great extent and without inconvenience—I may say to the improvement of this branch of the Legislature; that the same power continued to exist till the Union with Scotland, in which country it also obtained, and had been exercised from time to time;⁷ that in like manner the incorporation on that occasion of forty-five new members with the former number in England has produced no such inconvenience as is suggested; and lastly, that I have not observed or heard that the great and frequent fluctuation in the attendance here from under a hundred to perhaps five hundred and upwards, has been the cause of any essential distinction in the nature of parliamentary measures, considered in a constitutional view; for I do not think we are to be guided, in this part of the argument, by any consideration of the effects of such fluctuations, as to party, to points of a momentary nature, or to what are sometimes called trials of strength between individuals, or this and that class of men, on matters not of important consequence to the state and the community.

3. The next apprehension I am not sure whether I rightly understand; but I think it was stated as if it were conceived that the habits and turn of the Irish Gentlemen
who

⁷ Supra, p. 117.

who may be elected to the common Parliament, were likely to be such as to lower the standard, as it were, of British representation. I think it was said, that they are not of a substance and materials which can safely coalesce with this Parliament; that they would corrupt and contaminate the whole mass. Sir, I believe nobody imagined that in so liberal and respectable a quarter as that from whence this observation came, it was meant to express any sentiment derogatory to the general and natural disposition of the Irish nation. I presume the idea was, and such indeed was, I think, the effect of the language in which it was conveyed, that, partly from the imputed corruption of Irish politics, partly from the savage ignorance, and barbarity of the lower orders of people there, partly from the inveteracy of religious animosity, it was too probable, that the generality of the persons returned for Ireland would bring with them modes of thinking and acting, less pure, less rational, less dispassionate, than those which this hypothesis seems to assume as prevailing in this kingdom.

But, Sir, however much disposed I feel myself to think with just respect of the virtue and understanding of British Legislators, I must beg leave to say, that if the Honourable Gentleman to whom I allude had been well acquainted, which he professed not to be, with that class of men in Ireland, from among whom the representatives would of course be for the most part selected, he could not have suffered so idle a suggestion to enter his mind. Vulgar prejudice and national complacency do, with the vulgar of all countries, establish a sort of general impression of inferiority in the moral and intellectual qualities of neighbouring nations. I trust the members of this House

are

are far beyond the reach of such impressions. For my part, I am well persuaded Ireland is likely to furnish at least her fair proportion of genuine worth and genuine wisdom to the common stock of the imperial Parliament ; and that whatever defects may be supposed to belong to the modes and practice of legislation there, they arise from the nature of a local, as connected, in the manner I have endeavoured to explain, with an imperial Parliament, and are in no respect founded on any peculiar imperfection in the description of the individuals who compose it. It has been well and justly observed in this House, by one whose generous and elevated sentiments on this question stood in no need of the weight of his high character to impress them on our recollection, ‘ that the people of Ireland have not been less distinguished than those of Great Britain, in corresponding ‘ stations of life, for eloquence, for literary and scientific ‘ acquirements, and for those talents and exertions ‘ which have established the naval and military renown ‘ of the British empire.’ They will not, on their more intimate connexion with the rest of that empire, forfeit the pledge and earnest they have thus given. Indeed, Sir, we have already had sufficient examples in this very place to warrant that expectation ; for can Great Britain herself boast of many of her sons who have more illustrated this assembly than some of those natives of that country, who in our own days have sat in it, and who must already have occurred to the minds of all who hear me ?

4. As to the objection that the Union, as proposed, will be imperfect, and on that account not answer the ends intended, it was, I think, grounded chiefly on the distinction which will probably remain, and to which

some of the Resolutions point, in the financial systems of the two countries. Sir, this very objection was made on the part of England, by some Noble Lords in the other House, at the time of the Union with Scotland. When the Treaty came to be debated in the House of Lords, Lord *Haverſham*, in the speech I have already mentioned, ſaid, ‘ There is another reaſon why I am
 ‘ againſt this Union, becauſe I cannot think it an entire
 ‘ Union. The exempting articles, I mean the twenty-
 ‘ tieth, whereby heritable offices and ſuperiorities are
 ‘ reſerved; and alſo the one-and-twentieth, both which
 ‘ *Oliver*, by an act of ſtate, was ſo wiſe as to aboliſh;
 ‘ but eſpecially their act for ſecuring their preſbyterian
 ‘ church government and general aſſemblies, ſeem to
 ‘ me like thoſe little clouds in a warm calm ſummer’s
 ‘ day, that are generally the ſeeds and attractives of
 ‘ approaching tempeſt and thunder.’⁹ This was one of thoſe many prophecies which in the event have fortunately not been accompliſhed. Yet the differences which were allowed to continue and ſtill remain between
 the

⁹ The wiſdom and policy of aboliſhing the heritable jurisdictions was in the contemplation of King James, even before his acceſſion to the Crown of England, as appears by the following remarkable paſſage in the book called *Baſilicon Doron*, addreſſed by him to his ſon Prince Henry: ‘ But the greateſt hinderance to
 ‘ the execution of our laws in this country are the heritable ſherif-
 ‘ doms and regalities, which, being in the hands of the great men,
 ‘ do rack the whole country. For which I know no preſent remedy, but by taking the ſharper account of them in their offices;
 ‘ uſing all puniſhment againſt the ſlothful that the law will permit;
 ‘ and ever, as they become vacant for any offences committed, to diſpoſe them never heritably again; preſſing with time
 ‘ to draw it to the laudable cuſtom of England, which ye may
 ‘ the eaſilier do, being King of both, as I hope in God ye ſhall.’
 P. 48.

9 Continuation of Rapin, vol. xvi. p. 35.

the local arrangements and institutions in Scotland and England (several of them too, financial) were of much greater magnitude than any that are either proposed to be maintained, or indeed, considering the much greater similarity which already obtains, can exist after the Union with Ireland, between those of this part of Great Britain and of that country.

I believe a perfect uniformity in all the branches and minute parts of the frame of Government, never did take place as to all the different districts and divisions of the same country and nation, unless perhaps in some of those diminutive sovereignties which bear a nearer resemblance to corporations and municipalities, than to such states as England and Ireland.

In France, under the monarchy, though the general outline and distinguishing features were in a great degree uniform throughout; yet there prevailed in the different provinces, *fenechauffées*, *balliages*, &c. of which that kingdom was composed, a remarkable diversity in regard to many important particulars, such as the rights of property real and moveable; the administration of justice; the imposition and amount of taxes, and so forth; as to which, the different provinces with their subdivisions, after their successive incorporations with the kingdom at large, retained their ancient laws, usages, and customs. The same observation is true of the other great states of modern Europe, and will be found equally so in the instances of similar incorporations, as far as they are known to have taken place in ancient Greece and Italy.

In England itself, the unity of the government has never been thought imperfect, because of the different
rules

rules of property, the different forms and courts of judicature, the different local customs and usages, which obtain in the principality of Wales, in the duchy of Lancaster, and in the various districts, cities, boroughs, liberties, honours, and manors, throughout the kingdom.

On the accession of James the VIth of Scotland to the throne of England, the Judges¹ gave it as their opinion that there could be no incorporating Union of the two kingdoms without an entire conformity of laws in both. Sir *Francis Bacon* was of a different sentiment. He seems to have been strongly convinced of the great inconvenience of the attempt to establish so strict a uniformity, and that it was by no means necessary. ‘It is,’ says he in his ‘Brief Discourse, dedicated in private to his Majesty,’ ‘a matter of curiosity and inconveniency to seek either ‘to extirpate all particular customs, or to draw all subjects to one resort of judicature and session; it sufficeth ‘there be uniformity in the principal and fundamental ‘laws both ecclesiastical and civil.’² Even with regard to manners he observes, ‘that a consent in them is to be ‘sought indeed industriously, but not forced; for that ‘nothing among people breeds so much pertinacity in ‘holding their customs as sudden and violent offers to ‘remove them.’³ And in another tract, stated ‘to ‘have been dispersed for his Majesty’s service,’ after some argument to shew the difficulty of composing a general and uniform code for the two kingdoms, he concludes, ‘that such a general code would be too great a work to ‘embrace.’⁴

According

¹ Co. 4 Inst. c. 75. p. 347.

² *Bacon’s Works*, vol. ii. p. 157.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 167.

According to the judicious reflection of a modern author, ‘ Experience has now happily confirmed the justness of that great man’s sentiments, and both nations have reason to rejoice that the subtle reasoning of the Judges met not with the same regard as on that occasion, in the reign of the great-grand-daughter of James.’

At that time, when the long-projected incorporation came to be carried into effect, it soon appeared that an endeavour at any such conformity of laws would be attended with insurmountable difficulties. Their ancient jurisprudence and tribunals were therefore, in general, preserved to each country, and even a fundamental difference functioned between the ecclesiastical laws and establishments of the one and the other, which Lord *Bacon* seemed to think scarcely practicable.

It remains for me now, before I conclude, to say a very short word or two of the two counter-projects which have been recommended to the House.

The one is, a repeal, without condition or distinction, of all laws in both countries affecting Roman Catholics, and a free communication and permanent security of every branch of trade to the sister kingdom. By these means, it is said, you will produce the only desirable Union between Great Britain and Ireland, the Union of hearts and affections.

As to the first part of this scheme, though I have declared my intention on this occasion to avoid entering into the general merits of the Catholic question, as it
would

would stand on the supposition of a Union, I have no scruple to state my concurrence with those who think that an attempt to grant what is called Catholic emancipation, while the local Parliament remains, would excite such a struggle between property and numbers as would greatly aggravate many of those mischiefs which now exist in Ireland, tending to revolution and separation, through the medium of a civil war of the most destructive and ferocious kind.

I have, in a former part of what I have said, anticipated the answer to the commercial part of the proposal, and shewn, that if we were inclined, or it were right to grant every thing that may still be wanting to an entirely free trade, we could not give permanent security to the grant otherwise than by Union.

With regard to the union of hearts and affections, I will not recur again to any discussion of that sentimental kind of connexion of late so much talked of by persons not apt to be led astray by a glare of words, but which, unless arising from one of a coarser but more intelligible sort ; that which a permanent and unchangeable identity of interests and an indissoluble *conspiratio et consensus partium* in the political machine have a necessary tendency to produce and perpetuate ; is, in my judgment, mere idle and unprofitable declamation.

The other project is the reverse of this ; if I have understood it, it might be thus expressed : ‘ Beware of the
 ‘ Catholics of Ireland ; tread back the rash and incon-
 ‘ siderate steps you have taken in their favour ; erase
 ‘ them again from the catalogue of electors, and re-enact
 ‘ against them that Popish code, the relaxations of
 ‘ which,

' which, at least till the last in 1793, have been the uni-
 ' versal boast and praise of his Majesty's reign on both
 ' sides of the channel : let there, however, be this modifi-
 ' cation in your proceeding, that although all Romanists,
 ' as they were called, shall be *primâ facie* considered as
 ' having, by their *presumed* share in the late conspiracy
 ' and rebellion, forfeited all the privileges their sect had
 ' recovered within the last twenty or thirty years ;
 ' yet each individual among them may take upon himself
 ' the burden of proving his innocence of that charge ;
 ' and, having established it (a jury being summoned I
 ' suppose to try each particular case), he shall not only
 ' be restored to those privileges, but shall, on such pur-
 ' gation, be put individually into the possession of every
 ' right belonging to Protestants.'

The hardship, cruelty, impolicy, and impracticability
 to any extent, of this scheme, I am satisfied did not, when
 it was thrown out, occur to the Hon. Proposer in the for-
 cible manner in which they must impress the minds of those
 who have had occasion to attend much to the late history
 and present condition of that kingdom. But the number-
 less difficulties which would belong to the execution of its
 detail, in establishing again a religious and Protestant,
 not a geographical and English pale, and in separating ;
 man by man, as they should present themselves to the out-
 let of that ideal fold of penalties and disabilities in which
 it is proposed to enclose and coop up the body of the
 Catholics ; the innocent from the guilty, the sheep from
 the goats, were pointed out in so clear a manner imme-
 diately after the plan was stated to the House, that it
 would be in vain to attempt to add any thing to what was
 then said.

Sir,

Sir, I am too sensible of the unusual length of the intrusion I have been guilty of on the time and indulgence of the House to continue it still longer, by any other apology than this, that as it has certainly not been my habit often to trouble them, so it shall be my practice in future to avoid trespassing on their patience, unless perhaps on some rare occasions, like the present, where, being particularly led by a sense of duty to the consideration of any question of importance, I may feel it to be an irresistible part of that duty to submit to them the grounds of my opinion, and the reasons and motives for my vote.

A P P E N D I X.

No. I. Page 1.

1. *The King's Message, presented by Mr. Secretary Dundas,
22d January 1799.*

HIS Majesty is persuaded that the unremitting industry, with which our enemies persevere in their avowed design of effecting the separation of Ireland from this kingdom, cannot fail to engage the particular attention of Parliament, and his Majesty recommends it to this House to consider of the most effectual means of counteracting and finally defeating this design; and he trusts that a review of all the circumstances which have recently occurred (joined to the sentiment of mutual affection and common interest) will dispose the Parliaments of both kingdoms to provide, in the manner which they shall judge most expedient, for settling such a complete and final adjustment as may best tend to improve and perpetuate a connexion essential for their common security, and to augment and consolidate the strength, power, and resources of the British empire.

2. *Address thereupon presented to his Majesty, 24th January 1799.*

We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled, beg leave to return your Majesty the thanks of this House for your Majesty's most gracious message; and to assure your Majesty, that, impressed with a deep sense of the magnitude of the objects to which your Majesty is pleased to direct our attention, and anxious at all times, and particularly at the present crisis, to avail ourselves of every opportunity to improve and perpetuate the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland (so essential to their common security,) and to promote the strength and prosperity of every part of the British empire, we shall not fail to enter on this consideration

A a

with

with all due dispatch, and with the diligence and attention which its transcendent importance demands.

3. *Resolutions, as moved by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and voted in the Committee of the whole House, 14th Feb. 1799.*

FIRST.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, in order to promote and secure the essential interests of Great Britain and Ireland, and to consolidate the strength, power, and resources of the British empire, it will be advisable to concur in such measures as may best tend to unite the two kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland into one kingdom, in such manner, and on such terms and conditions, as may be established by Acts of the respective Parliaments of his Majesty's said kingdoms.

SECOND.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That it would be fit to propose, as the first article, to serve as a basis of the said Union, that the said kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland shall, upon a day to be agreed upon, be united into one kingdom, by the name of 'The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.'

THIRD.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the same purpose, it would be fit to propose, that the succession to the monarchy and the imperial crown of the said United Kingdom shall continue limited and settled in the same manner as the imperial crown of the said kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland now stands limited and settled, according to the existing laws, and to the terms of the Union between England and Scotland.

FOURTH.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the same purpose, it would be fit to propose, that the said United Kingdom be represented in one and the same Parliament, to be styled, 'The Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland;' and that such a number of Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and such a number of Members in the House of Commons, as shall be hereafter agreed upon by Acts of the respective Parliaments as aforesaid, shall sit and vote in the said Parliament on the part of Ireland, and shall be summoned, chosen, and returned, in such manner as shall be fixed by an Act of Parliament of Ireland,

previous:

previous to the said Union; and that every Member, hereafter to sit and vote in the said Parliament of the United Kingdom, shall, until the said Parliament shall otherwise provide, take and subscribe the same oaths, and make the same declarations, as are by law required to be taken, subscribed, and made, by the Members of the Parliaments of Great Britain and Ireland.

FIFTH.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the same purpose, it would be fit to propose, that the churches of England and Ireland, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, shall be preserved as now by law established.

SIXTH.

Th at it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the same purpose, it would be fit to propose, that his Majesty's subjects in Ireland shall, at all times hereafter, be entitled to the same privileges, and be on the same footing, in respect of trade and navigation, in all ports and places belonging to Great Britain, and in all cases with respect to which treaties shall be made by his Majesty, his heirs or successors, with any foreign power, as his Majesty's subjects in Great Britain:—That no duty shall be imposed on the import or export between Great Britain and Ireland of any articles now duty-free; and that on other articles there shall be established, for a time to be limited, such a moderate rate of equal duties as shall, previous to the Union, be agreed upon and approved by the respective Parliaments; subject, after the expiration of such limited time, to be diminished equally with respect to both kingdoms, but in no case to be increased:—That all articles, which may at any time hereafter be imported into Great Britain from foreign parts, shall be importable through either kingdom into the other, subject to the like duties and regulations as if the same were imported directly from foreign parts:—That where any articles, the growth, produce, or manufacture of either kingdom, are subject to any internal duty in one kingdom, such countervailing duties (over and above any duties on import to be fixed as aforesaid) shall be imposed as shall be necessary to prevent any inequality in that respect:—And that all other matters of trade and commerce, other than the foregoing, and than such others as may, before the Union, be specially agreed upon for the due encouragement of the agriculture and manufactures of the respective kingdoms, shall remain to be regulated from time to time by the United Parliament.

SEVENTH.

SEVENTH.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the same purpose, it would be fit to propose, that the charge arising from the payment of the interest, or sinking fund for the reduction of the principal of the debt incurred in either kingdom before the Union, shall continue to be separately defrayed by Great Britain and Ireland respectively :— That, for a number of years to be limited, the future ordinary expenses of the United Kingdom, in peace or war, shall be defrayed by Great Britain and Ireland jointly, according to such proportions as shall be established by the respective Parliaments previous to the Union; and that, after the expiration of the time to be so limited, the proportion shall not be liable to be varied, except according to such rules and principles as shall be in like manner agreed upon previous to the Union.

EIGHTH.

That it is the opinion of this Committee, That, for the same purpose, it would be fit to propose, that all laws in force at the time of the Union, and all the courts of civil or ecclesiastical jurisdiction, within the respective kingdoms, shall remain, as now by law established, within the same, subject only to such alterations or regulations, from time to time, as circumstances may appear, to the Parliament of the United Kingdom, to require.

[*Note.* The first, second, third, fourth, sixth, and eighth, were agreed to by the House without amendment.]

4. The Fifth and Seventh Resolutions, as amended in the House.

FIFTH.

That for the same purpose it would be fit to propose, that the churches of that part of Great Britain called England, and of that part of Great Britain called Scotland, and of Ireland, and the doctrine, worship, discipline, and government thereof, shall be preserved as now by law established.

SEVENTH.

That for the same purpose it would be fit to propose, that the charge arising from the payment of the interest, or sinking fund for the reduction of the principal of the debt incurred in either kingdom before the Union, shall continue to be separately paid by Great Britain and Ireland respectively :—That for a number of years to be limited, the future expenses of the United Kingdom, in peace or war, shall be defrayed by Great Britain and Ireland jointly, according to such proportions as shall be established by the

the respective Parliaments previous to the Union; and that after the expiration of the time to be so limited, the mode of jointly defraying such expenses shall be regulated according to such rules and principles as shall be in like manner agreed upon previous to the Union, for the purpose of establishing gradually an uniform system of taxation through every part of the United Kingdom.

5. *Address, voted by the House of Lords, and agreed to by the Commons, 22d April 1799.*

We, your Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and Commons, in Parliament assembled, humbly beg leave to assure your Majesty, that we have proceeded with the utmost attention to the consideration of the important objects recommended to us in your Majesty's Message respecting the connexion between this country and Ireland.

We entertain a firm persuasion that a complete and entire Union between Great Britain and Ireland, founded on equal and liberal principles, on the similarity of laws, constitution, and government, and on a sense of mutual interests and affections, by promoting the security, wealth and commerce of the respective kingdoms, and by allaying the distractions which have unhappily prevailed in Ireland; must afford fresh means of opposing at all times an effectual resistance to the destructive projects of our foreign and domestic enemies, and must tend to confirm and augment the stability, power, and resources of the empire.

Impressed with these considerations, we feel it our duty humbly to lay before your Majesty such propositions as appear to us best calculated to form the basis of such a settlement, leaving it to your Majesty's wisdom, at such time and in such manner as your Majesty, in your parental solicitude for the happiness of your people, shall judge fit, to communicate these propositions to your Parliament of Ireland, with whom we shall be at all times ready to concur in all such measures as may be found most conducive to the accomplishment of this great and salutary work. And we trust that, after full and mature consideration, such a settlement may be framed and established by the deliberative consent of the Parliaments of both kingdoms, as may be conformable to the sentiments, wishes, and real interests of your Majesty's faithful subjects of Great Britain and Ireland, and may unite them inseparably in the full enjoyment of the blessings of our free and invaluable constitution, in the support of the honour and dignity of your Majesty's Crown, and in the preservation and advancement of the welfare and prosperity of the whole British empire.

6. *Extract from his Majesty's Speech, on the Prorogation of the Parliament, 12th July 1799.*

I have the satisfaction of seeing that internal tranquillity is in some degree restored in my kingdom of Ireland.

The removal of the only remaining naval force of the enemy to a distant quarter must nearly extinguish even the precarious hope which the traitorous and disaffected have entertained of foreign assistance.

But our great reliance for the immediate safety of that country must still rest on the experienced zeal and bravery of my troops of all descriptions, and on the unshaken loyalty and voluntary exertions of my faithful subjects in both kingdoms.

Its ultimate security can alone be ensured by its intimate and entire Union with Great Britain; and I am happy to observe, that the sentiments manifested by numerous and respectable descriptions of my Irish subjects justify the hope, that the accomplishment of this great and salutary work will be proved to be as much the joint wish, as it unquestionably is the common interest, of both my kingdoms.

No. II. Page 1.

1. *Extract from the Speech of the Marquis Cornwallis, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, on the opening of the Session of the Irish Parliament, 22d January 1799.*

THE zeal of his Majesty's regular and militia forces, the gallantry of the yeomanry, the honourable co-operation of the British fencibles and militia, and the activity, skill, and valour of his Majesty's fleets, will, I doubt not, defeat every future effort of the enemy; but the more I have reflected on the situation and circumstances of this kingdom, considering on the one hand the strength and stability of Great Britain, and on the other those divisions which have shaken Ireland to its foundations, the more anxious I am for some permanent adjustment which may extend the advantages enjoyed by our sister kingdom to every part of this island.

The unremitting industry with which our enemies persevere in their avowed design of endeavouring to effect a separation of this kingdom from Great Britain must have engaged your particular attention, and his Majesty commands me to express his anxious
hope,

hope, that this consideration, joined to the sentiment of mutual affection and common interest, may dispose the Parliaments in both kingdoms to provide the most effectual means of maintaining and improving a connexion essential to their common security, and of consolidating, as far as possible, into one firm and lasting fabric, the strength, the power, and the resources of the British empire.

2. Paragraph in a Motion made the same Day, in the House of Commons, for an Address to the Crown.

The unremitting activity with which our enemies persevere in their avowed design of endeavouring to effect a separation of this kingdom from Great Britain, must constantly engage our most earnest attention; and as your Majesty has condescended to express an anxious hope that this circumstance, joined to the sentiment of mutual affection and common interest, may dispose the Parliament in both kingdoms to provide the most effectual means of maintaining and improving a connexion essential to their common security, and of consolidating, as far as possible, into one firm and lasting fabric, the strength, the power, and the resources of the British empire, we shall not fail to give the fullest consideration to a communication of such momentous importance.

3. Amendment thereto, proposed by Mr. Ponsonby, but rejected.

A motion was made, and the question being put, that an amendment be made in the foregoing motion by inserting after the word *importance*, the following words, viz. ‘but maintaining the undoubted birth-right of the people of Ireland to have a free and independent Legislature, resident within this kingdom, as it was asserted by the Parliament of this kingdom in 1782, and acknowledged and ratified by his Majesty and the Parliament of Great Britain upon the final adjustment of the discontents and jealousies then prevailing among his Majesty’s loyal subjects of this country:’

It passed in the negative. Ayes 105.—Noes 106.

And then the question being put on the original motion, It was carried in the affirmative.

4. Amendment thereto, adopted, 24th January 1799.

The Address having been prepared, and reported 24th January 1799, the above (2) forming the tenth paragraph,

The question being put, that the said paragraph stand part of the said Address,

It passed in the negative. Noes 109.—Ayes 104.

5. *Extract from the Lord Lieutenant's Speech, on the Prorogation of the Parliament, 1st June 1799.*

I have his Majesty's particular commands to acquaint you that a joint Address of the two Houses of Parliament of Great Britain has been laid before his Majesty, accompanied by Resolutions proposing and recommending a complete and entire Union between Great Britain and Ireland, to be established by the mutual consent of both Parliaments, founded on equal and liberal principles, on the similarity of laws, constitution, and government, and on a sense of mutual interests and affections. His Majesty will receive the greatest satisfaction in witnessing the accomplishment of a system, which, by allaying the unhappy distractions too long prevalent in Ireland, and by promoting the security, wealth, and commerce of his respective kingdoms, must afford them at all times, and especially in the present moment, the best means of jointly opposing an effectual resistance to the destructive projects of foreign and domestic enemies; and his Majesty, as the common father of his people, must look forward with earnest anxiety to the moment when, in conformity to the sentiments, wishes, and real interests of his subjects of Great Britain and Ireland, they may all be inseparably united in the full enjoyment of the blessings of a free constitution, in the support of the honour and dignity of his Majesty's Crown, and in the preservation and advancement of the welfare and prosperity of the whole British empire.

I feel most sensibly the arduous situation in which I am placed, and the weight of the trust which his Majesty has imposed upon me at this most important crisis; but if I should be so fortunate as to contribute in the smallest degree to the success of this great measure, I shall think the labours and anxiety of a life devoted to the service of my country amply repaid, and shall retire with the conscious satisfaction that I have had some share in averting from his Majesty's dominions those dangers and calamities which have overspread so large a portion of Europe.

No. III. Page 20.

1. *Extract from the Records of the Privy Council of Scotland.*

At Edinb. the eighth day of September, one thousand seven hundred and two years.

Sederunt.

Lo. Chancellor,
M. Lothian,
E. Craford,
E. Marr,

E. Buchan,
Vis. Tarbat,
Vis. Rosbery,

Lo. Polwarth,
Lo. Advocat.
Lo. Provost of Edin.

LETTER from the Queen to the Council for calling and indicting a new Parliament read and order'd to be recorded, whereof the tenor followes.

Sic supra scribitur, Anne R.

' Right trustie, &c. Wee greet yow well; Haveing upon weighty considerationes thought fitt to call a Parliament of that our ancient kingdome to meet at Edinburgh the twelfth day of November nixt ensueing the date hereof; Wee have now sent yow here inclosed a Proclamation to be issued for that purpose; which yow are to take care to be timely published with all the solemnities usuall upon the like occasiones, for doing whereof this shall be your warrant; and so Wee bid yow heartily farewell. Given at our Court at Windsour Castle, the 25th day of August 1702, and of our rigne the first year. By her Majestie's command, *sic subscribitur*

' QUEENSBERRY.'

Proclamation under her Majestie's royall hand calling & indicting the said new Parliament to meet at Edinburgh the twelfth November nixt; and the samen being read in their presence, the Council ordained the said Proclamation to be recorded, printed, and published, at the marcat crofs of Edinburgh, and at the marcat crosses of the remanent head burghs of the severall shyres & stewartries of this kingdome. And appoints her Majestie's Solicitors to transmit copies therof to the respective Shirriffs and Stewarts of this kingdome, to the effect they may convene the freeholders within ther respective bounds, and the magistrats of their respective burghs their tounne councils, furth with to elect their respective Commissioners to the ensueing Parliament. Off the which Proclamation the tenor folloes.

' Anne, by the grace of God, Queen of Great Brittain, France, and Ireland, defender of the faith, &c. To all and sundrie our good subjects whom these presents doe or may
B B
' concerne

' concerne, greeting; Whereas the late Parliament of that our
 ' ancient kingdome is by our authority dissolved; and consider-
 ' ing that Wee are ingadged at present in a most just and neces-
 ' sary warr; and that by acts past in the Parliament both of
 ' Scotland and England Wee are impowered, & have accord-
 ' ingly nominat Commissioners to treat of an Union betwixt
 ' these our kingdomes, & of other things, matters, & causes;
 ' relateing therto; conforme to the tenors of the saids acts, the
 ' consension of which Union to be established and ratified in
 ' both Parliaments, will undoubtedly conduce to the lasting
 ' peace & wellfare of both kingdoms; for which causes, and
 ' that Wee judge it necessary ther should be a Parliament in being
 ' to meett on such occasions as may requyre it, Wee have ther-
 ' fore thought fitt to call a Parliament of that our kingdome to
 ' meet at our city of Edinburgh upon the twelfth day of Novem-
 ' ber nixt ensueing the date of these presents: Wee doe ther-
 ' fore requyre & command all Dukes, Marquesses, Earles,
 ' Viscounts, Lords, and Officers of State of our said kingdome,
 ' to be present & attend at that dyet; and Wee doe also re-
 ' quyre & command all our Shirriffs in the severall shyres &
 ' their deputies furth with to call & convene all the freeholders
 ' in the respective shyres, to the end that according to the lawes
 ' & acts of Parliament, electiones may be made of fitt persones
 ' to be Commissioners for this Parliament. And Wee doe lyk-
 ' ways requyre & command our royal burrowes to make choise
 ' of Commissioners accordingly; & them & all persones haveing
 ' intrest to attend this our Parliament under the paines contained
 ' in our lawes made theranent; and to the effect all our good
 ' subjects may have nottice of this our royal will & pleasure,
 ' Wee doe hereby command our Lyon King of Armes, & his
 ' bretheren Heralds, Macers, Pursevants and Messengers at
 ' Armes, to make timeous proclamations of these presents at the
 ' marcat cross of Edinburgh, & at the marcat crosses of the
 ' head burghes of the severall shyres of that our ancient king-
 ' dome. Given at our Court at Windsour Castle, the 25th Au-
 ' gust 1702, & of our reigne the first year. By her Majestie, *sc*
 ' *subscribitur*

' QUEENSBERRY.'

2. *Commission by the Freeholders of Edinburghshire.*

' Be it knowen to all men by thir present letters, Wee the
 ' barrons & freeholders of the shireffdome of Edinburgh
 ' principall, being mett & convened within the Parliament
 ' Howse thereof, to the effect underwritten, be vertue of inti-
 ' matione and advertisement from the shireff principall and his
 ' deputy; and wee takinge to our consideratione that the last
 ' Parliament is dissolved, and that ther is ane new Parliament in-
 ' died

dicted by her Majesty Queen Ann, to meet att Edinburgh on the twelfth day of November nixt to come; and that it is necessar wee have four commissioners elected to represent this shyre in the said Parliament, and severall meetings and sessions therof; and wee being first qualified by swearing the oath of aledganes to her Majesty Queen Ann, and subscriyving the same with the assurance; and haveing knowledge of the fidelitie, fittness, and abilitie of the persones underwritten, to the effect aftermentiouat: Wee have therfore nominated, elected, and chosen, and heirby nominats, electis, & choisés, Sir Robert Dundas of Arneston, ane of the Senators of the Colledge of Justice; Sir James Prinrose of Caringtoun, Sir Robert Dickson of Inveresk, and George Lockhart of Carnwath, to be our four Commissioners to represent the said shyre in the next ensewing Parliament and severall meetings and sessions therof, to whom wee heirby give full power, warrand, and commissione, to compear for the said shyre in the said nixt Parliament and severall meetings and sessions therof; and ther to meet, consult, and assemble with the noblemen and others Commissioners for the shyres and royall burghes of this kingdom, and to sitt in the saids meetings and sessions of Parliament; and conferr, treate, vott, consult, and determine in all poynts, acts, and effaires, that shall happen to be debated, proponed, and concluded in the saids meetings and sessions of Parliament; and all and everie thing to doe therin, sicklyk and as freelie in all respects, and to all intentis and purposes, as any other Commissioner for this shyre, or any other Commissioner within this kingdom hes done or may doe in the lyke caices. And for the mair securitie, we consent thir presents be insert & registrat in the bookes of Parliament, &c.' Dated 30th September 1702.

3. *Commission by the Burgh of Edinburgh.*

Be it knowen to all men be thir presents, Us the Lord Provost, Baillies, Council and Deacons of crafts ordinar and extraordinar of the burgh of Edinburgh; forasmuchas it having pleased the Queen's Majesty to call a Parliament of this kingdom to meet at Edinburgh upon the twelfth day of November nixt ensueing the dait of thir presents; therfor wit ye us to have, nominate, constitut, and ordained, likeas we be thir presents nominate, constitut, and ordaine Sir Patrick Johnston present Lord Provost of Edinburgh, and Robert Inglis, goldsmith, and present Deacon Conveener of the incorporations thereof, to represent us as our Commissioners in the said Parliament, giving, granting, and committing to them our very full, free, plain power, exprefs bidding, mandament and charge, for us in our names and upon our behalf, to meet and convene with the remanent Commissioners of the free royall bur-

rows.

' rows of this Kingdom in the said ensueing Parliament, to be
 ' holden at Edinburgh the said twelfth day of November nixt,
 ' with continuation of dayes, and there in our names and upon
 ' our behalf to sitt, treat, reason, vote, and conclude upon all
 ' and whatsomever maitters that shall happen to be proponed and
 ' treated upon in the said Parliament; firm and stable holding,
 ' and for to hold all & whatsomever our saids Commissioners
 ' does in the premises, in so far as may concerne the glory of
 ' God, the Queen's honour, the wellfare of the kingdom, this
 ' church, and estate of burrowes. Attour we testifye our said
 ' Commissioners to be men fearing God, of the true Protestant
 ' religion presently professed and authorized be the laws of this
 ' kingdom without suspicion in the contrare; the one a merchant,
 ' the other a tradesman, inhabitants within this burgh, bearing all
 ' portable charges with their neighbours, and are such as may
 ' tyne and win in all our affaires. In witness whereof, &c. &c.'
 Dated 11th September 1702.

No. IV. Pages 24, 57.

1. *Resolutions of a Meeting of the Freeholders of the County of Louth.*

AT a numerous and respectable meeting of the Freeholders of the county of Louth, held at Dundalk, Monday, January 14, 1799, the following Resolutions were unanimously agreed to :—

John M'Clintock, jun. Esq. High Sheriff, in the chair :

Resolved, That it is the duty, as well as the right of the freeholders and burgeses of Ireland, to express their sentiments on the subject of a Union.

That our Representatives were not empowered at their election to surrender the constitutional privileges of their constituents.

That the rapid improvement of this kingdom since the date of her legislative independence clearly evinces, that an independent Irish Legislature is as necessary as British connexion to the prosperity of Ireland.

That a Union would not only deprive us of many of our dearest rights, but render the enjoyment of the remainder precarious and uncertain, and would for ever destroy the security that Ireland now possesses for their continuance.

That it is impolitic and unwise to agitate at this time a question that may lead to a recurrence to first principles.

That,

That, firmly attached as we are to British connexion, we do totally disapprove of the plan of a Legislative Union between Great Britain and Ireland.

That these our sentiments be communicated to our Representatives, in whose attachment to the constitution and true interests of Ireland we have the most firm reliance.

2. *Answer of the Right Hon. John Foster, Speaker of the Irish House of Commons, on receiving the Communication of the foregoing Resolutions.*

Gentlemen, I thank you for your sentiments, and it is a great satisfaction to me to find my opinions strengthened by your explicit declaration, that an Irish independent Legislature is as necessary as British connexion to the prosperity of Ireland. The House of Commons have said so in strong language, when they stated to his Majesty in 1782, that the very essence of our liberties exists in the right of a *sole* Legislature—the Parliament of Ireland—a right which they then claimed on the part of all the people as their birthright, and which they declared to his Majesty they could not yield but with their lives. I joined in that statement—and we were afterwards told from the Throne that both countries had pledged their good faith to each other, that their best security would be an inviolable adherence to that compact; and we were desired to convince the people that the two kingdoms were then one, indissolubly connected in unity of constitution and unity of interest. Nothing then remains to strengthen our Union—we have adhered to that compact, so has Great Britain, and we have risen to prosperity with a rapidness beyond example since it was made. I see no circumstance either of imperial concern or local necessity, which can justify our attempting a change, much less such a change as would annihilate that birthright, by the confirmation of which our trade and manufactures felt a security that immediately roused a happy spirit of exertion, the surrender of which would not only make the employment of those exertions precarious, but would equally take away all security of permanence from every advantage which any persons might be ignorantly deluded into a hope of from the projected measure of a Legislative Union. In truth, I see much danger and a probable decrease to our trade and manufactures, from the measure; and I cannot conceive any one advantage to them from it. If the linen manufacture rests at all on any compact, that compact was made with the Irish Parliament, the extinction of which takes away a security we have found adequate, and leaves it without the protection of its natural guardians, who by their vigilance, their regulations, and their bounties, have more than doubled its exports within a few years past. As an Irishman, then, I should oppose the measure, and

and as a member of the empire I should not be less averse to it; for the innovation which it would make in the constitution of Great Britain, with whom we must stand or fall, may so endanger that constitution, as in the end to overturn it, and with it the whole of the empire. Nor can I look on the circumstances of the times, without deprecating its being proposed, when the French proceedings teach us the danger of innovating on established constitutions, and when it must be peculiarly alarming to Ireland, scarcely rested from a cruel and unprovoked rebellion, to have the public mind again agitated by an unnecessary, unprovoked, and unsolicited project. These are my sentiments. The entire confidence you repose in my attachment to the constitution and the true interest of Ireland, call upon me to state them fully to you—you shall not find that confidence misplaced. I shall oppose the measure; and I remain, with the most perfect esteem and affection,

Your very obliged and faithful humble servant,

Jan. 15.

JOHN FOSTER.

No. V. Page 74.

An Account of the Register Tonnage, belonging to the several Ports of Great Britain and Ireland, in the following Years, distinguishing some of the principal Ports of Great Britain.

	1793.	1795.	1797.
Liverpool —	96,694	83,175	87,093
Bristol —	40,289	29,556	23,611
Hull —	57,891	61,494	64,477
Whitehaven —	56,415	57,187	54,925
Newcastle —	123,821	126,962	128,294
Sunderland —	63,015	69,997	73,505
All the other Ports of England —	756,625	779,528	820,640
Total of England	1,204,750	1,207,899	1,252,545
Glasgow —	42,850	37,234	32,110
All the other Ports of Scotland —	116,325	108,157	104,422
Total of Scotland	159,175	145,391	136,532
Ireland —	67,790	58,765	53,181

No.

No. VI. Page 90.

1. *Extract from the Evidence of Mr. JOSIAH WEDGWOOD, before the Committee of the whole House, in the House of Commons, 2d May 1785.*

THE principal raw materials of which our present earthen wares are made are clay and flint stones. The former, Ireland has of her own, and, as I am told, of the best quality; but if this should not be so, she has been, and therefore no doubt she can be again supplied with it from the same places that we ourselves are; and this at little more than half the expense which it costs us when delivered in Staffordshire. The latter (flint stones) she has much cheaper still; as we now fetch them for the potteries in Staffordshire from the shores which surround Ireland.—My authorities for the existence, abundance, and cheapness of the raw materials necessary for carrying on an earthen-ware manufactory in Ireland are persons who have had specimens of the clay sent to them here for trial, and the evidence of Mr. *Evans*, engineer of the Grand Canal making across Ireland, which was laid before the Irish House of Commons in 1783.—He states, that on the banks of the Grand Canal less than 30 miles from Dublin, ‘there is flint for making flint ware, clays for potteries, and ‘pipe-clay for making Staffordshire ware.’—We must likewise take into the account the carriage, freight, loss by breaking, and the duties on our ware on its importation from Staffordshire into Ireland, amounting all together to 40 per cent.—P. 177, 178.

2. *Extract from the same Gentleman’s Evidence before the Committee of the whole House, in the House of Lords.*

When potteries are established in Ireland, and the natives are taught that business, I apprehend that a manufacture of a similar kind with what is now made in Staffordshire may be purchased at 40*l.* or 50*l.* per cent. cheaper, on a most moderate calculation, than we can afford to sell it in Staffordshire.—Some of the raw materials for the finer species of earthen-ware we have ourselves from Ireland, viz. the flint-stone; and I am told they have the clay likewise of a very good quality. There are some tons of it now in a pottery, sent to be tried by a person who lives in Ireland a great part of his time; he has a warehouse there, and a pottery in Staffordshire. He has some tons of this Irish pipe-clay to make a trial of. He told me before I came to London that he had tried it, and that it was very good. These are the principal articles of raw material of our manufacture.—Is the flint of Ireland equal
te

to ours?—If you take it all together, it is not equal to ours; but it is brought to Liverpool by way of ballast, and there *we* employ agents to pick out such as are good from the ballast when thrown out.—Is that which is so picked out as good as that of the eastern coast *?—I do not think it is, because they bring it from the coast; and flint exposed to the air for any time acquires a metallic quality. It comes from many parts of Ireland. There is a trace of it near Dublin, which they used when they set up a manufacture of queen's ware there.—Is there any great expense in separating the good from the bad?—No. Any man accustomed to the grinding it knows directly which is good and which is bad. When their natives have learned the business in as good perfection as ours have here, I apprehend that less than 40*l.* or 50*l.* per cent. would scarcely be a protecting duty. When I said the flint was not so good, I had reference to that which is picked up promiscuously. That picked up from the Irish shore and taken to any places convenient for a pottery work, must be in the vicinity of water carriage. Therefore the carriage, which makes a very great proportion of the value of our raw material, at least five sixths or six sevenths of the whole value, will be so much expense saved by taking the flint from the Irish shore and carrying it in lighters to the manufactories there; so that they will have the flint I might have said one third, but I am sure they might have it at one half of what it costs us, and they may have the coal from our pits at little more than half the price, owing to our very inland situation.—I have made calculations upon it. The day, when delivered on board a ship, used to be about 6*s.* or 7*s.* per ton. When it arrives in Staffordshire, it is from 36*s.* or 38*s.* to two guineas per ton; so that the difference between 6*s.* per ton and the expense of the carriage is near two guineas †; and on that account, there being no inland carriage to Dublin, they can have it from our clay-pits at little more than half the price that we have it.—There is sagger clay in several parts of Ireland. In almost every place where coal and iron stone are found, that species of clay accompanies it. It is along the banks of the New Canal that runs across the kingdom. Mr. *Evans*, Surveyor of the Grand Canal, gave in a report to the Irish Parliament last year, in which he says there are coals of equal quality with the Whitehaven coals, sufficient for the supply of the whole kingdom; and there is clay for potters. By which I suppose he means the coarse kind of pipe-clay for Staffordshire ware. And there is a canal not a great many miles from Dublin; so that there seems, in that happy spot, the finest situation for a potter, because he has all the materials under his own hand.

P. 145. 152. 157. 160, 161.

* Query?

† Query?

IRISH REVENUE, 1797.

	Gross.			Nets.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Consolidated fund	964,524	7	3 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Inland excise, exclusive of } appropriated duties, &c. }	428,064	9	0			
Licences — —	75,560	11	5			
Appropriated duties —	319,689	9	1			
	<hr/>					
	1,787,838	16	9 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Deduct management, } bounties, and other } articles charged on in- } cidents — — —	456,035	11	5 $\frac{7}{8}$			
	<hr/>			1,331,803	5	3 $\frac{6}{8}$
Stamps — —	109,035	4	3			
Deduct charges — —	20,924	11	1 $\frac{3}{4}$			
	<hr/>			88,110	13	1 $\frac{1}{4}$
Post-office — —	68,256	6	11 $\frac{1}{2}$			
Deduct charges — —	50,653	18	9			
	<hr/>			17,602	8	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
Total net revenue	<hr/>			1,437,516	6	7 $\frac{1}{2}$

Gross sums.			
1,787,838	16	9 $\frac{1}{2}$	
109,035	4	3	
68,256	6	11 $\frac{1}{2}$	
<hr/>			
1,965,130	8	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	Total gross revenue.

No. VIII. Page III.

SCOTCH REVENUE, 1797.

<i>Branches.</i>	<i>Gross Produce.</i>			<i>Net Produce.</i>		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Customs — —	403,536	15	11	324,644	19	2 $\frac{3}{4}$
Excise — —	958,173	19	0 $\frac{1}{2}$	827,237	17	1 $\frac{1}{4}$
Stamps — —	123,978	5	3	112,380	0	0
Land and assessed taxes	104,061	15	9	98,768	6	11
Salt — — —	27,314	5	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	21,816	10	8 $\frac{3}{4}$
Post-office — —	109,793	6	4	94,810	1	10 $\frac{1}{2}$
rs. on pensions, &c. —	4,136	4	9 $\frac{1}{4}$	3,985	15	8 $\frac{1}{2}$
6d. on pensions, &c. —	3,477	9	1 $\frac{3}{4}$	3,392	13	7 $\frac{3}{4}$
Total	1,734,472	2	3 $\frac{3}{4}$	1,487,036	5	2 $\frac{1}{2}$

No. IX.*

SCOTCH REVENUE, 1798.

<i>Branches.</i>	<i>Gross Produce.</i>			<i>Net Produce.</i>		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Customs — —	539,284	15	7	439,231	11	10
Excise — —	965,252	18	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	807,796	8	1 $\frac{1}{4}$
Stamps — —	140,609	15	3 $\frac{1}{4}$	126,727	6	6
Land and assessed taxes	209,209	17	4	205,108	13	8
Salt — — —	59,523	9	3 $\frac{3}{4}$	51,782	13	6 $\frac{1}{4}$
Post-office — —	110,701	14	3	95,639	4	9 $\frac{1}{2}$
rs. on pensions, &c. —	39,937	11	0 $\frac{1}{4}$	39,684	5	3 $\frac{3}{4}$
6d. on pensions, &c. —	3,003	7	5 $\frac{1}{4}$	2,965	16	7 $\frac{1}{4}$
Total	2,067,523	8	5 $\frac{3}{4}$	1,768,936	0	4

* This is extracted from an account laid before the House of Commons 13th June 1799.

No. X. Page 110, Note.

RATES OF POSTAGE IN IRELAND, 1797.

	Postage of a single letter.
From any post-office in Ireland to any place in the same kingdom, not exceeding 15 miles from such office, and not passing through Dublin — — —	s. d. 0 2
Above the distance of 15 miles and not exceeding 30 miles, and not passing through Dublin — —	0 3
Above the distance of 30 miles and not exceeding 50 miles, and not passing through Dublin — —	0 4
Above the distance of 50 miles and not exceeding 80 miles, and not passing through Dublin — —	0 5
And all beyond 80 miles, and not passing thro' Dublin	0 6
Between Dublin and London by way of Holyhead	0 8
Between Waterford and London by way of Haverford west — — — —	0 8
Between Donaghadee and London by way of Portpatrick	1 3

No. XI. Page 110, Note.

RATES OF POSTAGE IN SCOTLAND, 1797.

	Postage of a single letter.
Between London and Edinburgh, Dumfries, or Cockburnspeth — — — —	0 8
From any post-office in Scotland to any place not exceeding one stage from such office — — —	0 3
From any post-office in Scotland to any place in the same kingdom, above one stage, and not exceeding 50 miles, and not passing through Edinburgh — —	0 4
From any post-office in Scotland to any place in the same kingdom above 50 and not exceeding 80 miles, and not passing through Edinburgh — — —	0 5
From any post-office in Scotland to any place in the same kingdom above 80 and not exceeding 150 miles, and not passing through Edinburgh — —	0 6
From any post-office in Scotland to any place above 150 miles, and not passing through Edinburgh — —	0 7
Between Portpatrick in Scotland and Donaghadee in Ireland, by packet-boats, over and above all other rates — — — —	0 2
Letters to and from any part of England and any part of Scotland, not passing through London, Edinburgh, Dumfries, or Cockburnspeth, are not chargeable, if single, higher than — — — —	0 8

No. XII. Page 117.

Extract from Craig De Feudis.

SED de Parliamentis hoc unum monuisse sufficiat, nihil ratum esse, nihil legis vim habere, nisi quod omnium trium ordinum consensu conjuncto constitutum est; ita tamen ut uniuscujusque ordinis per se major pars consentiens pro toto ordine sufficiat. Scio hodie controverti, an duo ordines Parliamenti, dissentiente tertio, quasi major pars, leges condere onera sive realia sive personalia imponere, statuta nova introducere possint, cujus partem negantem boni omnes, & quicumque de hac re scripserunt, pertinacissime tuentur, alioqui duo ordines in everfionem tertii, possunt convenire. Quod de everfionem dixi, idem de præjudicio & incommodo intelligendum.

No. XIII. Page 123.

Extract from Sir William Petty's Political Anatomy of Ireland.

IF all men were bound to spend the proceed of their land on the land itself; then as all the proceed of Ireland ought to be spent in Ireland, so all the proceed of one county in Ireland ought to be spent in the same; of one barony in the same barony; and so parish and manor; and at length it would follow, that every eater ought to avoid what he hath eaten upon the same turf where the same grew. Moreover, this equal spending of wealth would destroy all splendour and ornament; for if it were not fit that one place should be more splendid than another, so also no one man should be greater or richer than another; for if so, then the wealth—suppose of Ireland, being perhaps 11 millions, being divided amongst 1,100,000 people, then no one man having above 10*l.* could probably build a house worth perhaps 3*l.* which would be to leave the face of beggary on the whole nation; and with all such parity, would beget anarchy and confusion,—P. 84, 85.

F I N I S.